

JAPANESE RELIGIONS

VOL. 2, NOS. 2,3. — MAY 1961



A QUARTERLY

issued by

THE CHRISTIAN CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF
JAPANESE RELIGIONS

日本の諸宗教

CONTENTS (目次)

NEWS AND NOTES	By Sabae Kobayashi	1
FROM CONFUCIUS TO CHRIST		
	By Dr. Tetsutaro Ariga	6
儒教からキリスト教へ	有賀鉄太郎	20
THE CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS SITUATION		
IN JAPAN	By Dr. Joseph M. Kitagawa	24
現代日本における宗教事情	ジョセフ・M・北川	43
TILLICH ENCOUNTERS JAPAN		
	By Prof. Robert W. Wood	48
ティリッヒと日本との出会い	ロバート・W・ウッド	72
HENDRIK KRAEMER AND THE CHRISTIAN		
ENCOUNTER WITH JAPANESE BUDDHISM		
	By Rev. L. Newton Thurber	76
クレーマー博士と日本仏教	ニュートン・サーバー	91

EDITORS:

Tetsutaro Ariga, Sakae Kobayashi, L. Newton Thurber, Robert W. Wood

☆ ☆ ☆

ADDRESS OF 'THE JAPANESE RELIGIONS':

The Christian Center for the Study of Japanese Religions
10 Daido-cho, Shūgakuin, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto, Japan

COPYRIGHT RESERVED

Printed by Kawakita Printing Co., Kyoto, Japan

NEWS AND NOTES

N. C. C. Appoints Committee for Study Center

At a meeting called by the N. C. C. in January at the Christian Center in Tokyo ten persons were officially designated as members of the Special Committee for the Christian Center for the Study of Japanese Religions. Those selected were: Dr. Tetsutaro Ariga (chairman) of Kyoto University, the Rev. Tucker Callaway of the Japan Mission of the Foreign Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. Masatoshi Doi of Doshisha University, Dr. Charles Germany of the Interboard Committee for Christian Work in Japan, the Rev. Raymond Hammer of the Central Theological Seminary of the *Seikō-kai*, Dr. Kiyoshi Hirai, General Secretary of the N. C. C., Dr. Chitose Kishi of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Rev. Tsunetaro Miyakoda of The Japan Bible Society, the Rev. Gosaku Okada of the United Church of Christ in Japan, and the Rev. Harry Thomsen, Director of the present Study Center. The Special Committee belongs, for the time being, to the N. C. C. Department of Church Affairs, and the policies and administration of the Study Center will be carried on under the direction of this Special Committee. In addition, the Rev. Sakae Kobayashi of Kwansei Gakuin was asked to continue as Secretary of the Study Center, and the publication of the Quarterly, *Japanese Religions*, was placed under the direction of an Editorial Board composed of Dr. Tetsutaro Ariga, the Revs. Sakae Kobayashi, L. Newton Thurber, and Robert W. Wood.

Listening-in on Tillich Discussions

During the course of Dr. Paul Tillich's visit to Japan last year several meetings of especial interest to the readers of *Japanese Religions* were held in the Kansai area in May. As a world-reknowned

scholar in the fields of philosophy and religion, Dr. Tillich was particularly interested in visiting universities and religious institutions and in talking with eminent scholars and religious leaders. Several such discussion meetings were arranged by the Study Center, two of which have been transcribed from tape-recordings and are published in this combined issue of *Japanese Religions* under the title "Tillich Encounters Japan".

Dr. Hendrik Kraemer Visits Japanese Religious Centers

In October of last year Dr. Hendrik Kraemer, who in many ways is the father of the type of religious research centers represented by the Study Center, made a series of research tours to temples and shrines such as Nanzenji, Ryuanji, Ginkakuji and the Grand Shrine at Ise, and to the headquarters of various religious groups among which were Tenrikyo, Ōmotokyo, and Konkokyo. The trips were arranged by the Study Center and the Rev. Sakae Kobayashi of the Study Center accompanied Dr. Kraemer on several of them. Dr. Kraemer was particularly enthusiastic about his trip to the Grand Shrine at Ise during which one evening was spent in conversation with Mr. Suzuki, one of the officials of the Grand Shrine. Mr. Kobayashi reports his belief that this was one of the most helpful and illuminating conversations in recent years between a Christian theologian and a Shinto scholar, and he will report on the discussion in a subsequent issue of *Japanese Religions*. In the present issue the Rev. L. Newton Thurber reports in detail on an equally significant discussion between Dr. Kraemer and a group of Buddhist scholars and students of Otani University in Kyoto. We are pleased to be able to publish these for our readers.

Study Center Plans Public Lectures

At the January meeting of the Special Committee it was decided that the Study Center should begin sponsorship of public lectures

(primarily for Japanese Christians) in the area of its study and research. The first of these lectures will be held in June at the Christian Center in Tokyo with Dr. Tetsutaro Ariga, Dr. Masatoshi Doi and the Rev. Sakae Kobayashi as speakers. A second lecture will be sponsored in the Kyoto area later in the year. Further announcement concerning these lectures will be made through the bulletin of the N. C. C., the *Kirisutokyo Shimpo*, and other Christian publications.

Notes on Developments in Sōka Gakkai

To students of contemporary religious movements in Japan, Sōka Gakkai is perhaps the most interesting and important religious organization. And since the election last year of Mr. Daisaku Ikeda as the young thirty-two years old third President of Sōka Gakkai, new developments are beginning within the movement which will be of interest to our readers. Mr. Harry Thomsen, who has met and talked with Mr. Ikeda, reports that he is perhaps their most able leader, although also fanatical and intolerant.

Since Mr. Ikeda's election as President there has been a noticeable change in Sōka Gakkai's political strategy. Until 1959 the sect was characterized as a religio-political organization because it held some 20 seats in the Japanese Diet and more than one hundred seats in local legislative bodies throughout Japan. Last year, however, this political policy underwent change, and instead of Sōka Gakkai members standing for election in their own name, the new policy involved support of those candidates from other parties who were recognized as friends and sympathizers with the sect. But, as in previous elections, Sōka Gakkai adherents are alleged to have engaged in election obstruction, vote-buying, etc. The Ministry of Justice is now investigating these charges of election law violation, and Mr. Ikeda as well as other officials of Sōka Gakkai are under investigation.

A second development is suggested by an article written by the new President, Mr. Ikeda, entitled "Cultural Activities toward the

Establishment of a *Third Civilization*" which appeared last August in Sōka Gakkai's monthly magazine, *Dai Byaku Renge*. In this article Mr. Ikeda wrote that the "Third Civilization" means that of a peaceful world, the basis of which would be the *Dharma* preached by Nichiren (rather than by Sakyamuni), and the achievement of which would be through *Shakubuku* (positive proselytization). In keeping with this, Sōka Gakkai has apparently begun to move towards proselytization outside Japan, both in the West and in the East. In October, 1960, President Ikeda and other leaders of the sect flew to the Americas for visits in Hawaii, San Francisco, Seattle, Chicago, Toronto, New York, Sao Paulo, and Los Angeles. The *Seikyo Shinbun*, semi-weekly newspaper of Sōka Gakkai, reports that Ikeda held before war brides who met him at Idlewild International Airport the goal of becoming "First Lady" of the United States. The primary purpose of the visit to the Americas was to get in touch with those Japanese *Issei* and *Nisei* who had been unable to accept either the traditional Japanese Buddhism imported from Japan or the Christian Church.

After a rest of three months following this trip, President Ikeda and the Patriarch of the Nichiren Shō Shū, to which Sōka Gakkai belongs, paid visits to India, Burma, Ceylon and Thailand, but apparently the main destination of the trip was India where Sakyamuni was born and where the Lotus Sutra (the *Saddharma Pundarika Sutra*) was written. The *Seikyo Shinbun* reports that Ikeda and the Patriarch visited *Buddha-gaya*, and that in the sacred precincts of the Temple of the Great Enlightenment they buried a small tombstone inscribed with their slogan, "Preach the teaching of Nichiren throughout Asia." They also buried a copy of "The Outline of the Three Great Secrets" (*San Dai Hihō Shō*) which is said to be the work of Nichiren himself.

The tempo of growth in Sōka Gakkai continues to be remarkable. The Dec. 24th issue of *Seikyo Shinbun* reports that the number of adherents now includes 1,724,000 households.

For those who are interested in obtaining materials concerning the sect, the Study Center recommends a book published by the sect headquarters in English and entitled "The Sōka Gakkai". The price is ¥540 (or \$1.50) plus postage. The headquarters address is: Sōka Gakkai, Publishing Department, 7-32, Shinano-machi, Shinjuku-ku Tokyo.

Apologies for Delay in Publication

The Editors apologize for the delay in publication of this issue of *Japanese Religions*, and in the interests of meeting the old publication schedule we herewith present an enlarged issue combining No's. 2 and 3 of Vol. 2. The delay in publication has been due primarily to financial problems involved in the transition of the Study Center to new sponsorship under the N. C. C. The Editors wish to express great appreciation to the International Missionary Council, and especially to the Rev. Victor Hayward, General Secretary of the Study Department of the I. M. C., for the grant of financial support to the Study Center which has made continuation of the Quarterly possible.

The Editors anticipate that the Vol. 2, No. 4 issue will appear soon and that the regular publication schedule will be re-established with Vol. 3. We take this opportunity to thank subscribers and supporters of the Study Center for their patient waiting during the last few months.

FROM CONFUCIUS TO CHRIST

A Feature of Early Protestantism in Japan

by Tetsutaro Ariga

(A lecture delivered for the Kansai Asiatic Society, December 19, 1959)

I

This year (1959) Protestantism in Japan has celebrated its centennial because the first Protestant missionaries arrived in Japan in 1859. Those who came to Nagasaki were the Episcopalians, J. Liggins and C. M. Williams, and the Dutch Reformed, G. F. Verbeck. Those who came to Kanagawa were Presbyterian, J. C. Hepburn, and Dutch Reformed, S. R. Brown and D. B. Simmons. The next year J. Goble, a Baptist missionary, arrived in Yokohama; then in 1861 J. Ballagh, a Reformed missionary, came to Kanagawa. In 1862 D. Thomson, another Presbyterian, arrived likewise in Kanagawa. As a medical missionary, Hepburn practiced medicine but also opened a private school. Ballagh and Brown also opened their own schools; then the three schools were merged. Although they were not allowed publicly to proclaim the gospel, their Christian influence was felt among their young pupils. Nine of them were baptized by Ballagh on March 10, 1872, and formed the first Protestant congregation in this country. The next year the Yokohama Kokai, as the church was called, counted as many as 62 adult members. Out of this Yokohama band arose some of the greatest leaders of Japanese Protestantism, such as Yoichi Honda, Kajinosuke Ibuka, Masatsuna Okuno, Hogi Oshikawa, and Masahisa Uemura who became the most influential of all the leaders of the Presbyterian-Reformed type. Honda became later a Methodist and in 1907 was chosen the first bishop of the Japan Methodist Church.

In the Kansai area, congregations were organized in Kobe and Osaka due to the efforts of the Congregational missionaries, D. C. Greene and O. H. Gulick. But soon the Doshisha in Kyoto became a radiating center of Congregationalism in this country. This school was established in November 1875 by Jo Niishima, known widely as Joseph Hardy Neesima, who had defied the Shogunate law and gone to America for study. In 1876 a group of Christian young men from Kumamoto entered the Doshisha. They had been baptized by Captain L. L. Janes, the chief teacher of the Kumamoto School for Western Learning (*Yogakko*). Although they now came under the personal influence of Niishima, they were all independent souls and became great leaders of the Kumiai Kyokai (Congregational Churches). Danjo Ebina, Tsurin Kanamori, Hiromichi Kozaki, Tsuneteru Miyagawa, and Tokio Yokoi were among them. Of Ebina and Kozaki I shall speak more later.

The third group of importance arose in Sapporo. In 1876 the Meiji government established a school of agriculture and invited W. S. Clark from the state of Massachusetts to start it. He was a man of strong Christian conviction and during his eight months' stay left indelible impressions on his students. Seiken Oshima and Shosuke Sato were among his immediate pupils and became not only illustrious scholars but also prominent Christian laymen. Kingo Miyabe, Inazo Nitobe, and Kanzo Uchimura entered the school after Clark had left but became ardent Christians. Miyabe taught at his alma mater, Nitobe, who became a Quaker, served for a number of years as a Secretary General of the League of Nations. There is no need of saying that Uchimura became a great leader of the Non-Church Movement.

The earliest Protestant leaders of Japan arose almost invariably from the samurai class. For samurai were the only men who could receive higher education under the Tokugawa Shogunate. They were trained in Confucianism and had to undergo a rigorous samurai dis-

cipline. Even after they became Christian they retained in many respects their samurai consciousness. This combination of Christian faith and the samurai spirit gave a certain peculiar character to them as Christian leaders, which in its turn affected the general trend of Protestantism in Japan. So we shall now study how in the cases of Hiromichi Kozaki and Danjo Ebina their inherited samurai consciousness was combined with, or overcome by, the Christian faith they accepted.

II

First let us examine a book put out by Kozaki (1856-1938) in April 1886. It is entitled *Seikyo Shinron*, which may be translated as *A New Treatise on the Relationship between Politics and Religion*. It discusses a comparative appraisal of Confucianism and Christianity in special reference to the formation of a new Japan since the Restoration of 1868. The author compares the great change that had taken place in Japan to the French Revolution, but says the revolution in Japan has been more radical than the earlier one in Europe because Japan has felt an impact of foreign civilization and culture, which has made a total social and cultural renewal imperative.

It was only eighteen years after the Royal Restoration when Kozaki wrote this book. Both politically and socially, conditions were still chaotic. As a Christian patriot he was naturally concerned about the future of his nation and its culture. This is why he has chosen for his theme a comparison between Confucianism and Christianity, ignoring for the moment Shinto and Buddhism. He argues that Confucianism represents the past pre-Meiji social setup but now Christianity should replace it as the basic principle for the upbuilding of a new democratic nation. During the Tokugawa period it was the samurai class and not the other three classes that sustained the spiritual life of the Japanese. In a sense, they were the Japanese; and they were the ones who were thoroughly trained in the doctrine of Confucianism.

Therefore, says Kozaki, Confucianism is all that matters as we examine the basic principles of the traditional social order of Japan. To quote his own words :

"Confucianism has contributed most for the organization of our society and for the maintenance of its customs and thoughts. Although Buddhism was not without influence, its adherents were confined to the classes lower than the samurai. Therefore its influence on our national society as a whole has been insignificant. Also, as an other-worldly religion, it seems to have been willing to let Confucianism take care of worldly affairs. Shinto has been more or less systematized since the days of Motoori and Hirata, but its role in the uplift of the people's spirit and the sustenance of their mores has been far smaller even in comparison with Buddhism. Cases there were in which Shinto had some influence on the minds of our people. But in such cases it was not Shinto itself but rather doctrines borrowed from Confucianism that had edifying effects on them."

It is for this reason that Kozaki has singled out Confucianism for his discussion. Buddhism and Shinto seem to him to be so insignificant not only for the past history but also for the future development of Japan. The only alternative relevant to him is therefore: Confucianism or Christianity. If only the inadequacy of the former be proven, any thoughtful Japanese will inevitably be induced to accept the adequacy of Christianity for the building of a new modern state. So Kozaki analyses Confucianism as it was interpreted and used during the Tokugawa period and tries to prove how insufficient the whole ethical structure based on the principles of *chu* and *ko* is for a progressive society where freedom and equality should prevail. It is a teaching closely bound up with a feudalistic social order, whereas Christianity contains within itself all the necessary basic principles for a democratic society. In this connection he also criticizes those who say secular movements for social and political reconstruction are

sufficient. For man does not live by bread alone. It is a great mistake to ignore religious and moral issues because people should be sustained spiritually as well as materially.

According to Kozaki, Confucianism has been necessary for preparing the Japanese people for Christ just as Greek philosophy had educated and prepared the Greeks for the acceptance of the gospel. Not only Confucianism but all the good virtues fostered by Buddhism and Shinto will find their fulfilment in Christ. Only Christianity, however, is able to provide the idea of the Kingdom of God where each individual is recognized as an individual. And from this basic principle ensue freedom and equality. Also, Christianity alone can raise the status of women to that of equality to men. It alone can reform society by removing all sorts of moral and social evils. Furthermore, it alone can help maintain friendly relations between the nations of the world. As Christianity is the conscience of the Western society, so Japan also must adopt and accept Christianity as her basic religious principle. Kozaki, however, does not advocate making Christianity a state religion. He insists that religion and state should be kept separate but their separation should not mean religious indifference. Freedom of religious belief is indeed the most important condition for the healthy development of religious life.

In his presentation of Christianity Kozaki is moderately liberal, or rather, moderately conservative. (The conservatives blamed him for his acceptance of higher criticism while the radicals labeled him as a conservative.) He shows positive appreciation for the basic doctrines of traditional Protestantism. He may not be called an original thinker; but his criticism of Confucianism with his alternative "Confucianism or Christianity" had set an pattern for the subsequent development of Protestantism in this country. It was indeed relevant in so far as Confucianism, especially as incorporated in the Rescript on Education, continued to be the basic ethic of Japan till the end of last war. It was only during 1930's that Shinto became influential

as an element of the rising totalitarian trend in our political thought and practice. Nevertheless, it was unfortunate, especially from our present-day viewpoint, that Kozaki and other great Christian leaders of the Meiji period, being of the samurai origin, had shared the samurai prejudice against Buddhism and Shinto. For precisely because these were the religions of the lower classes upon whom the samurai looked down, they were bound to be more important factors of the society where all the former classes were mixed. This point they seem to have missed. And here perhaps should be sought the chief reason why Japanese Protestantism has been able neither to extend its influence widely beyond the educated middle classes nor to answer successfully challenges made by Buddhism, Shinto, and more recent popular sects.

III

Let us now turn to Danjo Ebina (1856-1937). He was Kozaki's classmate both in Kumamoto and in Kyoto. But he was a man of different temper, more philosophical and introspective. Fortunately he has left us a short autobiographical sketch of his soul's development. Its title is *Waga Shinkyō no Yurai to Keika* (*The Origin and Development of My Christian Faith*). It was originally an address delivered by him at Doshisha Church, Kyoto, in 1922. I shall try to reproduce it here in English as much as it is relevant for our present purpose. His recollection goes back to the earliest years of the Meiji era, which he characterizes as the years of iconoclasm. All the traditional religious values were then discredited. Not only the youth but also the government itself was for destruction. Especially hard on Buddhism was the policy of the government, which allied itself with Shinto over against Buddhism. And yet this did not mean that the Shinto shrines received much respect. Ebina says:

"The period was only busy with destruction, not ready yet to build up. The only good thing about it was that there was no

room left for superstition. Young people were grateful for the fact that they did not have to fear ghosts any more. Their world had been cleansed of anything uncanny. No more religion was there and atheism was spreading. There was neither god nor buddha; neither heaven nor hell. Everything looked bare and transparent. Belief in supernatural beings was ascribed to the working of our nervous system. People thought they were now living in an age of science. Thus my contemporaries and I ceased to believe in the divine when we were eleven or twelve years old."

Hand in hand with the destruction of old beliefs there went on also the demolition of old moral ideas. The great political leaders of the period had been mostly *rōnin* free from all social ties and conventions. They often divorced their wives and married *geisha* girls or waitresses. They were the ones who advocated the practice of entertraining one's guests in a restaurant with the service of *geisha* girls, whereas during the Tokugawa period social parties had been held in homes. Even the concepts of *chū* (loyalty) and *kō* (filial piety) were losing their significance. The feudal system having been abolished, the samurai had no more their immediate objects of loyalty. People also called in question one's duty of absolute obedience to his parents. The Confucian scriptures were often treated merely as scraps of paper and that quite literally for they were actually used for making a *fusuma* sliding-door.

To this whole situation Ebina reacted in the following way:

"However, I was not satisfied with nothing but destruction. The sense of loyalty to one's lord had been so long cultivated in my mind that I could not do without an object of my loyal devotion. I aspired for an authority. In my home life, too, there was hardly any communication possible between my conservative parents and myself who was for progress. They were not willing to encourage their son to do what he wanted. So I was discontent,

to which feeling, however, I did not dare to give vent. And this situation caused me to feel lonely."

Thus he began his search for a higher authority. In Kumamoto he was first trained in the Confucian *Shushi* School doctrine of *kakubutsu chichi*, according to which true knowledge is to be obtained through the study of things as they are. This training made his approach to natural science easier. At the School of Western Learning he studied among other things physics, chemistry, and astronomy and was struck with awe when he learned all things happened according to the laws of nature. At the same time the thought that the universe is infinite suggested to him that the totality of things is far beyond human perception.

A sense of mystery was awakened thus to him. He contemplated on the meaning of *ten* (heaven) and came to the conclusion that it must be more than the Reason which the *Shushi* School had taken it to be. He thought it might correspond to what the Westerners called God. So the concept of *ten* acquired to him a personalistic coloring, though he was not ready to worship it. To him prayer was a superstition, nothing but an incantation, a *gokilō*. Even after he became a Christian he hated to apply the Japanese term *kitō* for prayer. He would prefer the word *inori*, which, however, had a connotation of "cursing" as in the phrase *inori-korosu* ("to curse someone to death"). So finally he adopted the English word "prayer" into his Japanese vocabulary.

Now Confucianism taught a distinction between the *shishin* (selfish mind or arbitrariness) and the *honshin* (true mind). When young Ebina experienced within himself a conflict between his *honshin* and *shishin*, between his reason and lust, he felt a real need for prayer. However, he kept his inner struggle to himself for two long years because he was afraid of being despised by his fellow students for his religious concern.

It was Captain Janes who taught him how to pray. One Saturday

evening a discussion meeting was held in his home. The teacher bade his students stand up for prayer. Then after reading a passage from Scripture he explained that prayer was a creature's duty to his creator. By this word of Captain Janes the mind of Ebina was suddenly opened up. He realized that he was only a created being, so he should not be living just for himself. It was to him a Copernican revolution, a change from self-centeredness to God-centeredness. He called it his internal Royal Restoration (*ōsei ishin*). Up until that time his conscience had been impotent to control his passions; but now he found his true lord and his conscience gained authority. It was a great uplifting experience that he could now have access to the presence of the lord and ruler (*jōtei*) of the universe.

This was the beginning of his Christian experience, in which he found something deeper and better than Confucianism. Still, as Ebina confesses, it was a sort of ethical religion and nothing more. Man was related to God as a subject to his lord. There was yet no realization of the fatherhood of God. There were some other students who had similar experiences but they as well as Ebina himself all wanted to be alone. They sought quiet places among the hills and spent much time in prayer and meditation. Psalms and Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* became now favorite readings for Ebina. With much sympathy he studied the history of Puritanism and felt the only way for him to go was to join the historic march of the Christian pilgrims.

In this way he discovered the purpose of his life. But there came temptations. Once his samurai consciousness was reawakened as he watched a military parade in Kumamoto. He was so overwhelmed by the sight that he was almost absent-minded for three days. Should he not live for military glory rather than for the spread of Christianity? Indeed, the figure of a St. Paul, whom he imagined to be a sort of Saigyō Hoshi, looked to him so shabby in contrast with the glory of a military commander. After three days, however, he realized that

he had been dreaming. Since then he never felt the temptation of a military career. Another temptation was that of a political career. He had been thoroughly trained in the Confucian doctrine of *chikoku hei-tenka*, i. e., providing order and welfare to the nation and to the world at large. It took him more time to get rid of political ambition. There were in Kumamoto certain young men engaged in political activities. When Takamori Saigo led the revolt of the Satsuma boys against the Tokyo government, they joined it in the hope that a republic might in this way be set up on the island of Kyushu. Some of these Kumamoto boys were reading the New Testament and some were even baptized Christians. Ebina felt much sympathy for them for he himself was vitally interested in the cause of civil liberty and people's rights (*jiyū-minken*). But he resisted the temptation to go with them, for he found he could not share their attitude toward freedom and equality. As against the Meiji government controlled by the Satsuma and Choshu leaders they always insisted on equality. But they were not necessarily willing to treat the common people as their equals. Their idea of equality was not consistent to Ebina the Christian.

He never felt the allurements of money—a trait characteristic of a samurai. But he had a burning desire for learning. Too much reading together with undernourishment due to poverty caused a certain eye trouble. He was forbidden by his doctor to read and he was compelled to retire into the innermost recess of his mind. There he discovered within himself many dirty thoughts and images. He abhorred his own intellectual ambition and vanity, which he thought had sprung from the passion of the self. He admits that in this respect he was then a disciple of Sakyamuni rather than of Jesus. He fought seriously against the desires of his own self “with a certain amount of success”. However, the thought that he might become blind made him despair. One day he was strolling through the Imperial Palace grounds in Kyoto and conversed in his mind with his

God. God asked him if he would love God rather than knowledge and beauty. He realized thereupon that God demanded from him absolute love and devotion. But he had not offered his total self to the altar of God. He had to admit that he had kept to himself what was God's, that he was guilty of theft before his creator. His consciousness of sin was thus deepened. He found a sin even in his act of reading the Bible. He thought he was sinning in the midst of his preaching. Any desire for the realization of his own possibilities he judged to be sinful before God. Then Ebina goes on describing his own experience as follows :

"Is there then nothing pure in my soul? I searched and found there a wish to please God. This was indeed a bit of genuine truthfulness within me and cannot be called a sin. Everything else within myself was sinful, however. God said he would give me nothing else but himself. He asked me whether I would be satisfied with him alone without the enjoyment of any other gift from him. This question meant a cross to me. I prayed as Jesus did in Gethsemane: If thou be willing, remove this cup from me. But finally I also resigned and prayed: Not my will, but thine, be done. There was nothing but despair, physically as well as mentally, left for me in this world. Only my aspiring love for God was with me. Then I sang :

Jesus, I my cross have taken,
All to leave and follow thee.
Naked, poor, despised, forsaken,
Thou from hence my all shall be.

Perish ev'ry fond ambition,
All I've thought and hoped and known.
Yet how rich is my condition,
God and heaven are still my own!

Everything else was thus taken away, but a child-like trust

in God was now granted to me. I was awakened to my status as an infant of God. He became my Father, no more simply the Lord of the universe. I was grateful for this experience because I could now for the first time call God my Father from the depth of my heart."

Even after this decisive experience, however, Ebina had to fight against his own spiritual pride. Because the very spiritual victory he had won over his ambitions and worldly aspirations made him arrogant. To his embarrassment he found within himself pride instead of infantile trust. He was deeply ashamed of himself before God and thought nothing short of having his old self crucified with Christ would save him from the depth of sin. Indeed, it took him ten years of such inner struggles to attain to the consciousness of divine sonship as a result of his participation in the mind of Jesus Christ.

IV

From Ebina's autobiographical sketch above outlined his general theological tendency suggests itself. He tried indeed to understand and interpret the Christian Gospel in the light of his own religious experience. His method was the same as that of modern liberal theology in the West. He learned also from the writings of liberal theologians how to explain the traditional Christian dogmas in the light of history. It is interesting to observe that in his book on *Sammi-ittai no Kyogi to yoga Shukyo-teki Ishiki* (The Dogma of the Trinity and my Religious Consciousness), 1902, he presented the Trinitarian dogma in its historical context and development and also tried to give his own interpretation in the light of his religious experience. In this book he is not Unitarian. For he is in full sympathy with Athanasius over against the Arians. However, he is a Trinitarian not in the sense of orthodoxy but according to his own religio-philosophical principles. This book was therefore made a target of much criticism on the part of more conservative ministers and

theologians. They said he was not evangelical. He was even called a heretic—not without justification, for his doctrine of the Trinity was, as might be expected from his premises, quite Sabellian. So he defended his position in a book entitled *Kirisuto-kyo no Hongi* (The Essential Meaning of Christianity), 1903. There he analyses Christian thought into two different types. On the one hand there is the type of theology represented by Paul, Augustine, and Luther. On the other hand there is the type of theology, more mystical in contrast with the former which is more evangelical, represented by John, Origen, and Schleiermacher. Needless to say that Ebina identifies himself with the latter rather than the former type. He pleads that the one is as much entitled to be called Christian as the other.

Ebina had a rare talent of eloquence. His prophetic remarks on political, social, and international issues were widely appreciated. But his theological thinking, based on his own peculiar religious experience and worked out by the help of a careful study of the history of Christian thought, could not so easily be followed by those who neither had a religious experience of that depth nor shared his historical knowledge and insight. Though a great orator, he was no writer. His books were in most cases either dictated by him or edited by his secretaries on the basis of the notes taken from his lectures. So he did not leave behind him such pieces of literature as did his great rivals Uemura and Uchimura. But throughout his long years of active service he was one of the most outstanding Christian figures of Japan.

It is interesting to note that his Christianity was in a sense a sort of transformed Confucianism. Like Kozaki and many others, he retained his samurai complex all throughout his life. He was intellectualistic, patriotic, and was always alert on political issues both on the national and international levels. In spite of his enthusiasm for democracy he had a certain elite-consciousness. The most glorious days for him were those in which he was pastor of the Hongo Church, Tokyo.

For then he could address himself, Sunday after Sunday, to a large audience composed mostly of professors and students of the Tokyo Imperial University. He was always proud of the fact that he could count among his disciples some of the best brains of Japan. Therefore, it will not be wide of the mark if we take him as a representative of the general type of early Protestantism in modern Japan.

儒教からキリスト教へ

有賀鉄太郎

一

今年(1959年)はプロテスタント宣教百年にあたる。1859年にリギンス、ウィリアムス、フルベッキらが長崎に来て以来、数々の宣教師が日本を訪れたが、当時ヘボン、バラ、ブラウンによってそれぞれ3つの学校が建てられ、多くの青年にキリスト教の影響を与えた。横浜バンドからは奥野昌綱、本多庸一、植村正久らが出た。一方、関西では1875年に同志社が設立されて組合主義の宣教の中心部となった。1876年には熊本バンドの海老名弾正、金森通倫、小崎弘道、宮川経輝が同志社に来て新島襄の影響を受けた。第三の札幌バンドの成立は1876年に明治政府の招聘によって来日したクラークが8ヶ月の滞在期間に青年たちに与えた影響によったものである。ここから宮部金吾、新渡部稲造、内村鑑三らが出た。

日本の初代プロテスタントの指導者たちは殆んどが武士階級の出身者たちであった。彼らは徳川幕府下での高い教育を受けた人々であり、儒教と厳格な武士道の訓練を受けていた。従ってキリスト者となった後も武士道の精神が残って、独特なプロテスタント主義の傾向を生み出したのである。そうした例を小崎弘道と海老名弾正の場合について見ることにしたい。

二

1886年に小崎弘道は「政教新論」を著わし明治維新後の新しい日本の形成と関連させて、儒教とキリスト教の比較評価を論じようとした。彼がその主題に儒教とキリスト教とを選び、神道と仏教とを不問に附したのは次のような理由からである。徳川時代に日本の精神生活を支えてきたのは武士階級であったが、彼らを鍛錬したのは儒教であった。従って日本の伝統的社会秩序の基礎的原理を知るための重要な要素は儒教である。仏教と神

道とは共に過去の歴史にとっても、将来の日本の発展にとっても重要とは思われない。儒教の倫理的構造は「忠」と「孝」の原理の上に成り立っているが、これらは自由と平等とを主な原理とする進歩した社会にとっては不十分である。それは封建社会と深く結びついた教えであるが、キリスト教は民主的社会にとって必要な根本的諸原理を含んでいる。

儒教はかつてギリシャ哲学が福音の受容を備えたように、日本の人々にキリストの備えをした。キリストは儒教及仏教と神道によって養われた徳の成就である。キリスト教によってのみ神の国の概念が備えられ、この基本的原理に立って自由と平等とが生み出される。更に、キリスト教は西欧社会の良心であるばかりでなく、そのみが国際的交友関係を可能にしてくれる。

彼の「儒教かキリスト教か」という批判は、その後の日本のプロテスタントの発展に一つの型を残した。今日の観点から非常に残念であると思われることは、明治時代のキリスト教指導者が武士階級の出身者として、仏教と神道に対する階級的偏見を持っていたことである。しかも、その事により重要な社会的要因を見逃していたことになる。この看過は、その後のプロテスタント主義の影響が、知識的中産階級の域を越えることが出来ず、又仏教と神道及新宗教から向けられた間に適切な応答をすることが出来なかった主な理由であったと思われる。

三

海老名弾正の精神遍歴は、「我が信教の由來と経過」の中に現わされている。明治の初期は旧習打破の時代であり、伝統的宗教、特に仏教の価値が軽視され、旧い道德概念が破壊された。封建制度が崩壊して武士階級は忠義の直接的対象を失った。彼は熊本で朱子学を学び、格物致知の概念を教育されたが、これは彼を自然科学に容易に近づけたのである。洋学校で物理学、化学、天文学を学ぶうちに、彼は凡ての事象が自然法則に従って起ることに驚異を覚え、同時に、宇宙の有限性と事物の全体が人間の認識

を越えていることに気づき始めた。この「天」についての概念は次第に人格的色彩を帯び始めた。当時、「祈祷」という概念は呪文であり、迷信以外のものを意味しなかった。そこで、彼は人格的働きを加味した「祈り」という言葉をそれに代えて採用した。祈りが被造物の創造者に対する義務であることを彼に教えたのはジェーンズ校長であった。彼はこの時、自分が被造物に過ぎず、彼自身を生の目的とすべきではないことを知った。彼はこれを内的王制維新と呼んでいる。

こうして彼は人生の目標を発見したが、そこにはまだ多くの誘惑がつきまとった。聖パウロのみすぼらしさに比べて、輝かしい軍人の栄光、儒教の治国平天下の思想に基いた政治的生涯への夢などであった。彼には武士の特徴として金銭的欲望はなかったが、学問に対する強烈な欲望を持っていた。しかし強度の読書と栄養不良が伴って眼を痛め、医師に読書を禁じられた彼は、精神的に深く沈潜することによって、そうした知的願望が利己的情熱から出たものであることを反省した。彼は神から絶対的な愛と献身の要求を迫られておりながら、その全存在を神に捧げていない自己の姿を実感した。彼は説教の唯中でも、聖書を読む行為の中にも、自己の可能性を實現しようとする凡ての欲望のうちに、神の前における罪を見出したのである。このように凡てのものが取り去られた時、神に対する幼児のような信頼が彼に与えられた。今や神が魂の奥底において父となられたことに対して、彼は心からの感謝を覚えたのである。その後、彼はこの霊的勝利が彼を尊人にすることに対して新しくたたかわねばならなかった。そうして神の前に深く恥じ、古き自己がキリストと共に十字架につけられた事以外は何も考えなかったのである。

四

彼はキリストの福音を自己の宗教体験の光の中で解釈しようとした。彼はキリスト教の伝統的教義を自由主義神学の方法を用いて表現しようと試みた。「三位一体の教義と余が宗教的意識」においては、三位一体の教義

を歴史的関係と発展において述べると同時に、それを自己の宗教的経験の光の中で解釈しようとしたのである。彼は「基督教の本義」の中で、キリスト教思想をパウロ、アウグスチヌス、ルターなどによって代表される福音主義的類型と、ヨハネ、オリゲネス、シュライエルマッハーなどによって代表される神秘主義的類型とに分け、自己の神学を後者の類型の中に置いている

海老名は雄弁家であつたが著作家ではなかつた。その著作の多くは口授されたものか、講演の編纂されたものである。そうした彼のキリスト教が武士階級の性格を反映して、一種の特権意識を残していることは甚だ興味深い事柄である。(辻 建要約)

THE CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN JAPAN

by Joseph M. Kitagawa

Introduction

Recently Dr. Hatta, the former vice president of Indonesia, remarked: "He who claims to understand the Indonesian situation must be badly informed." A similar observation could be made regarding the contemporary Japanese situation, and especially about its religious scene.

It is never an easy task to understand other countries, other peoples, and other religions, because we tend to see in others pretty much what we want to see. For example, some people associate Japan primarily with cherry blossoms, Mt. Fuji, and Geisha girls. Japan symbolizes for them the peace and serenity of the romantic past, which the West has long lost and forgotten. Others think of Japan as an area of rapid social, economic, and political change, where poverty stricken people are fighting for their survival and communists are on the march. Still others think of Japan as a spiritual nation, destined to offer religious insight and wisdom to the future of the world. It was reported two years ago that 10,000 copies of a small book on Zen Buddhism were sold in this country within a few weeks, and many people who once read Liebmann's *Peace of Mind* and Peale's *Positive Thinking* are now turning to D. T. Suzuki; the term "Zen" has broken into familiar usage, even among the beatniks. These views (and many others, too) touch certain aspects of contemporary Japan, and there is some truth in each one. However, it is extremely difficult to reconcile these contradictory trends and feel the spiritual pulse of present-day Japan. In the words of Sir George B. Sansom: "Few countries have been

more copiously described than Japan, and perhaps few have been less thoroughly understood."¹⁾

All of you know, I am sure, that Japan covers four main islands, and that its total area is less than that of California. Travellers soon fall in love with the beautiful scenery, but those who live there can also cite some of the hazards, such as earthquakes, typhoons, and volcanic eruptions. Moreover, the cost of the striking natural beauty of the mountains is that only about twenty percent of the land is arable, and outsiders may very well wonder how ninety million people can live in such a small space. Tokyo alone boasts a population of nine million.

Anyone who visits Japan today cannot help being confused by the peculiar mixture of the ancient Orient and the modern West. A few years ago, a visitor from England was intrigued by the sight of some devout worshippers at a Shinto shrine, bowing and clapping their hands in prayer, and next to them two young men practicing baseball. This visitor, however, realized how erroneous it would be to judge a group of people by their external behavior alone. In his words: "If it be true that the ghost of ancient Greece still walks in Athens, and if to understand the Jew some knowledge of the Bible and the sufferings of the Ghetto are required, the past, too, of Japan must never be forgotten."²⁾

Early Shinto

Much has been speculated but actually very little is known about prehistoric Japan. To be sure, we know something about the aboriginal Ainu, a semi-Caucasoid fishing and hunting people, whose descendants still live on the northern island of Hokkaido, but we cannot ascertain

-
1. Sansom, Sir George B., "Forward," *Japan—Past and Present* by Edwin O. Reischauer (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), p. vii.
 2. D'Arcy, M. C., "Japan after the American Occupation," *The Listener* (September 17, 1953), p. 455.

their influence on the non-Ainu groups who eventually overpowered them. Most scholars agree that the historic period of Japan started about 1,600 years ago when the dominant Yamato (ancient term for Japan) clan subjugated other peoples and established a small kingdom.

The religion of the early Japanese people was a simple cosmic religion, later known as Shinto, which is usually translated as the "Way of the gods." The early Japanese did not draw a sharp line of distinction between the heavenly and earthly domains, and they had only a vague notion about the life to come; they simply accepted life as it is with its hopes, fears, sufferings and frustrations. Central to their religion was the belief in *kami*, a term which is usually translated as gods or deities, but also means "above," "superior," or "divine," signifying anything which is the object of one's reverence and respect. Early Shinto was more than a polytheism or a nature worship; it accepted the whole of life and the cosmos as sacred because the *kami* pervaded everything. People recognized the *kami* nature in the sun, moon, water, earth-quakes, thunder, plants, rocks, birds, beasts, and fishes, as well as in human beings. The ancient Shinto myths repeatedly mention the eight hundred myriads of *kami*, which is one way of expressing the belief in the sacredness of the whole universe.

Early Shinto was not interested in speculating on the meaning of the world, because the meaning of the world was believed to be the world itself and not a reflection about it. The early Japanese never thought of themselves in any way separated from the cosmic existence and the rhythm of nature; they never pictured themselves as sojourners in this world. They were integral parts of this cosmos, which was a community of living beings and not of things. They felt a deep kinship with the world of nature, which to them was a majestic work of art. Indeed, Shinto has been characterized as the artist's way of life:

"Natural forces are the very subject matter for those who produce artifacts from raw material or who hunt and fish and farm. Thus Shinto taught succeeding generations of Japanese how such forces are

controlled and these formulas have become embedded in Shinto liturgies. Dealing, as this body of belief does, with the essence of life and with the spirits inhabiting all natural and many artificial objects, it came about that no tree could be marked for felling, no bush tapped for lacquer juice, no oven built for smelting or for pottery, and no forge fire lit without appeal to the Kami resident in each."³)

There were two main characteristics of early Shinto. The first was the sense of gratitude toward the *kami*. Sorrows there were, and so was there a sense of fear, but all in all life was good (*yoshi*) and beautiful, and human beings had every reason to be thankful for their lot in it. The second was the emphasis on purification. What concerned the early Japanese was not moral sins but physical and mental defilements, which had to be cleansed ceremonially by exorcism and abstention. To them, evil (*ashi*) did not exist within a person who performed the evil, because evil was believed to be caused by external factors. Essentially, evil was not a reality; it was a lack of harmony and beauty, and evil could be corrected by purification ceremonies (*harae*), performed by magician-priests.

It must be kept in mind that Shinto was a communal religion. The emphasis was placed on communal, collective acts and celebrations, and not on individual beliefs and decisions. We must remind ourselves in this connection that the early Japanese kingdom was in effect a confederation of powerful clans, held together by the religious authority of the imperial clan. Significantly, early Shinto equated the political administration (*matsuri-goto*) with religious rites (*matsuri*), and both of them were regarded as the duty of the emperor, who was the chief priest.

The unit of early Japanese society was the clan (*uji*), which was ruled by the clan head. Each clan was united not only by a common understanding as to the ultimate nature and purpose of life but also by its clan deity (*kami*). The entire clan turned toward its *kami* for

3. Warner, Langdon, *The Enduring Art of Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 18-19.

seasonal festivities and "transitional rites" (*Rites de passage*), such as birth, naming, initiation, marriage, sickness and recovery, and death and burial. Many clans regarded particular mountains as "other world," where paradise and hell existed together, and spirits of the dead were believed to go (or return) to one of these mountains. Usually, only the spirits of the noblemen and the priests were believed to become *kami*. The spirits of the dead were very close to the life of the clan, and the hereditary *shamans*, who in a trance could ascend to other worlds, played a significant role in the clan affairs. These features of ancient Shinto have been preserved to a significant degree by the religious life of the Japanese to our own day.

"Religio-cultural Waves" from Outside

Let us now briefly survey the historical development of Japanese religions, which can be conveniently discussed in terms of successive "religio-cultural waves" from outside. Each time a religio-cultural wave hit the island kingdom, a three-fold response followed. At first, a new religion or culture was eagerly welcomed, then there was a period of integration or assimilation, and finally the new religion or culture was either rejected or transformed by a re-assertion of the old spiritual heritage of Japan. We shall illustrate this three-fold movement in connection with the introduction of Chinese civilization, Roman Catholicism, and modern Western civilization.

The initial wave of Chinese culture penetrated Japan in about the fifth and sixth centuries, introducing the ethical teachings of Confucianism, the magico-mystical teaching of Taoism, and the gospel of Buddhism. During the first period that followed, roughly from the sixth to the eighth century, the impact of the continental influence overshadowed Shinto to the extent that during the eighth century (known as the Nara period) Japan appeared very much like a miniature of China, socially, politically, and even religiously. During the second period, roughly from the ninth to the twelfth century, Confucianism

and Buddhism were gradually assimilated by the Japanese, so that something like a "division of labor" developed among religious and semi-religious systems. For example, national and communal cults remained the prerogatives of Shinto, but public and private morality were delegated to Confucianism, and spiritual and metaphysical problems became the concerns of Buddhism. Finally, during the third period, roughly during the thirteenth century, the pendulum swung the other way. As Kublai Khan, the Mongol emperor of China, attempted to invade the island kingdom, which only a few centuries earlier had looked up to China with dreamy eyes, Japan asserted herself and fought the Chinese armada with arms. It was more than a matter of military conflict, however. In the religious domain, we find the emergence of native Japanese schools of Buddhism, such as the nationalistic Nichiren Sect, Amida Pietism, and Zen Buddhism, as well as the restoration of Shinto. The three-fold cycle was complete.

A second religio-cultural wave penetrated Japan from Europe in the sixteenth century. The first Europeans to come were the Portuguese, who were then establishing a great overseas empire in India and other parts of Asia. The Portuguese traders were soon followed by Roman Catholic missionaries; the famous Jesuit, Francis Xavier (d. 1552), and his companions arrived on Japanese shores in 1549. Roman Catholicism, then known as the "Kirishitan" Sect, was welcomed not only as a new religion but also as a symbol of European civilization. Some of the warrior lords (*daimyo*) dispatched emissaries to the Vatican and to courts of Catholic princes in Europe. Oda Nobunaga, the "strong man of Japan," favored Catholicism partly to counterbalance the excessive power of the established Buddhist monasteries, but this factor alone does not explain the rapid growth of Catholicism and European civilization in Japan during the sixteenth century. Many religious books, including Thomas a Kempis' *Imitatio Christi* and non-religious works such as *Aesop's Fables*, were widely circulated among the intellectuals. According to one report sent to the Vatican there were

about 150,000 Japanese Catholics near the end of the sixteenth century. It was difficult, however, to assimilate Catholicism into Japanese religious and cultural life, because Catholic Christianity professed singleness of allegiance, demanding an "either/or" decision from the Japanese. Japanese rulers issued prohibition edicts against Catholicism time and time again, but they did not enforce them because they were afraid of the military strength of the Catholic nations.

In the end, a severe blow came to the Catholics when, in 1637, thousands of Kirishitan men and women on the island of Kyushu rebelled against the feudal government. Although they fought valiantly, they fell when their food and munitions were exhausted. When the uprising was quelled, Japanese Catholics were ordered to renounce their faith; if they did not, they were either tortured or shipped out of the country. This brought an end to the colorful history of medieval Roman Catholicism in Japan.

Following the Catholic uprising, the feudal government took the far more drastic measure of "seclusion," cutting off all trade and other relations with foreign powers. This lasted for two and a half centuries, until the arrival of Commodore Perry in 1853. In order to exterminate Catholicism, the government required every family to belong to some definite Buddhist temple, thus making Buddhism *de facto* a department of the government. But the old pattern of division of labor among different religions was maintained. Shinto continued to be in charge of communal cults, while Confucianism provided the social and political theories and ethical principles. The warriors (*Samurai*) followed the semi-religious Code of Warriors (*Bushido*), and the masses found meaning and consolation in the eclectic, hamanistic folk religion, a blend of Shinto, Buddhism, and Taoism. On all accounts, Japan was a small, insignificant nation off the Asiatic mainland, but the Japanese had a sense of security based on the ethnocentricism which had been nurtured by the Shinto cosmological world-view.

Because of the seclusion policy, however, people did not know that

events were moving quickly in the rest of the world. They were not even conscious of the birth of the new republic across the Pacific Ocean. From this nation "Black Ships" led by Commodore Matthew Perry appeared off the shore of Japan in 1853.

Modern Western Civilization and Japan

A new cycle of the three-fold process began 100 years ago with the visit of Commodore Perry and ended with World War II. When modern Western civilization was introduced to Japan in the nineteenth century, Japan, like a hungry child walking into a candy store, tried to buy everything novel and good — a postal system, a civil service system, banks, a parliament, a constitution, railroads, electricity, an army, a navy, and an educational system. President Fillmore had instructed Commodore Perry to assure the Japanese officials that the United States was not like other Christian countries, since it did not interfere in religion at home, much less abroad. But the combined pressures of Western nations persuaded the Japanese government to lift the edict banning Christianity in 1873, and religious freedom was guaranteed in the Constitution of the same year. Western clothes took the place of the *kimono*; the man's traditional hair-do and sword-carrying were forbidden.

This situation fostered the rise of modern intellectuals with a Westernized education. Many young people felt that they were emancipated from the traditional cultural and religious values by Western science, democracy, Christianity, or atheism. As early as the 1870's, Mill, Darwin, Huxley, and Herbert Spencer were introduced, and soon Voltaire and Rousseau began to attract Japanese scholars. A little later, Kant, Hegel, and Schopenhauer became the intellectual idols of college students. Japanese Buddhists found their greatest inspiration in Schopenhauer, Spinoza, and Hegel. Among all forms of Western thought the most controversial was Christianity. While it never gained much in numerical strength, it drew eager followers from the ranks

of young intellectuals in the urban areas.

After a decade of initial enthusiasm for Western civilization, the situation changed somewhat. The hope of Western Christian missionaries and of the iconoclastic young Japanese to see Japan completely Westernized and Christianized was destined to give way to a series of disappointments. In this connection, we often forget that the architects of modern Japan attempted to develop a Westernized nation-state without losing the traditional religious and cultural framework. In 1889 the new Constitution guaranteed the freedom of religion, and at the same time the government banned religious instruction of any kind from all schools, public and private, although "moral teaching, if applicable to all religions, could be given." (Ordinance 12). What the Ministry of Education had in mind was to give a special advantage to Shinto, by interpreting it not as a religion but as a national morality and a patriotic cult. Henceforth education became the means of inculcating an ethnocentric nationalism and strengthening the emperor cult. For example, in the Imperial Rescript on Education (1890) we read :

Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting, and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue. Our subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof Ye, our subjects, be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends true ... always respect the Constitution and observe the law; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State; and thus guard and maintain the prosperity of our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth The way here set forth is indeed the teaching bequeathed by Our Imperial Ancestors, to be observed by their descendants and the subjects, infallible for all ages, and true in all places

Meanwhile, Japan's victories in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95) and Russo-Japanese War (1904-05) and the annexation of Korea (1910) strengthened the military clique, and Japan's unprecedented prosperity during World War I fattened the financial clique. In effect, parliament became a rubber stamp, and political stability was maintained by a

balance of power between the military and financial cliques. The throne was venerated, not as the political authority but as a tool of the ruling oligarchy. Buddhism and Christianity, as well as the sectarian Shinto denominations, which incidentally had been separated from state Shinto between 1882 and 1908, had to accept the special status of Shinto. From 1918 onward, much to the consternation of the conservative statesmen, financiers, and militarists, the demands for universal suffrage became vocal. Industrial workers began to organize unions, labor strikes were frequent occurrences, and a small Marxist group began to attract students. Any such movement was suspected as Bolshevik propaganda; the emperor cult, Shinto, Japanese Spirit (*Yamato Damashii*), and notional ethics (*Shu-shin*) were trumpeted as ideological weapons against all "foreign" and "dangerous" ideas.

In the 1930's Japan entered the third stage. All liberal thinking and expression, in religion, philosophy, art, or culture, was condemned as dangerous. The rights of freedom of the press, thought, and assembly, as well as the freedom of conscience and belief, were violated. Some elder statesmen and moderate parliamentarians who resisted the militarists' expansionist policies were assassinated. In 1936 Japan joined Germany in an anti-communist pact, and the government began to press all religious bodies to co-operate with the national aim to extend the imperial rule abroad. All religious bodies were encouraged to send their representatives to the front to pray for Japan's victory. In 1939, the Religious Bodies Law was enforced, by which the government could control all aspects of religious organizations, and Buddhism and Christianity were urged to unite their respective denominations. Further, a Religious League composed of Christian, Buddhist, and Sectarian Shinto denominations was organized in 1941 to provide a spiritual bulwark for the nation. The three-fold process was once more complete.

Post-war Japan

After Japan's surrender to the Allied Powers in 1945, another

cultural wave penetrated Japan, this time primarily from the United States. Even before the signing of the Peace Treaty, businessmen, students, scholars, religious people and government officials were sent *en masse* to America with "MacArthur Passports." Economically, politically, and culturally, Japan began to orient herself singularly to America. By the directives of the Occupation Forces, state Shinto was disestablished and the emperor publicly renounced his divine nature. Assured of the freedom of religious belief, practice, and propaganda, the Buddhist, Christian, and Sect Shinto denominations revitalized their activities. Taking advantage of the new situation, many splinter sects which were once identified with Buddhism or Shinto have separated from them, and numerous "New Religious Cults" (*Shinko Shukyo*) have emerged.

The complexity of the post-war situation in Japan is caused, in part, by the attitudes and policies of the United States toward Japan. In 1945, the Occupation Army announced a policy to create an advanced democracy, so that Japan was to become a neutral, de-militarized "Switzerland" in Asia. The year 1946 was described by General MacArthur as a year of legislative reform hardly surpassed in a comparative period during the evolution of civilized society. The American democratic crusaders suggested a model constitution, which was unanimously accepted by Japan, and 27 million people obediently voted in the general election. In 1947, American policy in Asia underwent a radical change, and the Occupation policy of democratization shifted to one of making Japan a strong anti-communist citadel in the Pacific. In 1948, MacArthur was convinced that the seeds of democracy which he had planted would bear fruit in the years to come; "that Christianity was making great strides in Japan, and that the occupation was being conducted according to the tenets of the Sermon on the Mount."⁴ In 1949, the Occupation authority interpreted its task as a friendly elder brother giving advice to a younger brother, as it were. In 1950,

4. *The Manchester Guardian Weekly*, August 28, 1952.

Japanese trade with Western nations was re-established, and in 1951 the Peace Treaty was signed in San Francisco. In 1952, an administrative agreement over terms for U. S. bases in Japan was signed, and the first anti-American riots took place in Tokyo. A revised treaty has been recently (January 1960) signed in Washington by the U. S. Secretary of State and the Prime Minister of Japan.

One of the sore spots in American-Japanese relations is the problem of rearmament. People in Japan feel that it was the Occupation authority which insisted on the complete de-militarization of Japan in 1945. As Joseph Alsop states: "We wrote a Japanese constitution forbidding national armaments in any form. But now we are pleading with the Japanese to rearm and they are coyly quoting our own constitution right back at us."⁵) The problem is partly an economic one, because rearmament costs about a billion dollars a year, which is a large sum of money for a starving nation. Even those Japanese who favored a limited rearmament take the attitude: "We will supply the men and the underwear; will you supply the rest." The U. S. on the other hand has been calling for more financial responsibility on Japan's part, and there is a disagreement between what Japan thinks she can pay and what the U. S. thinks Japan can pay. The military budget has been the favorite target of the General Council of Japan Trade Unions, left-wing intellectuals, and pacifists.

The picture is further complicated by the fact that external pressures on Japan come from the three divided worlds — the Free World, the Communist World, and the Uncommitted World of Asian nations. Although Japan has been closely identified with the Free World, geographically she is uncomfortably close to Communist Russia and Red China, and economically she has to trade with the uncommitted nations in Asia, if she wants to survive. Incidentally, the Japanese communist leaders have been split between the orthodox Marx-Lenin school (a carry over from the pre-war intellectual movement) and the village

5. *Chicago Sun-Times*, October 23, 1953.

communism school, admirers of the Chinese communist movement.

The Religious Situation in Post-war Japan

The religious situation in post-war Japan reflects the ambiguities and difficulties within the social, political, economic, and cultural realms. Recently, I have been struck by the fact that all visitors from Japan, from the prime minister down to students, in discussing her pressing problems, seem to chant in unison: "over-population and poverty." I do not suggest for a moment that these are not urgent problems; they are. My concern, however, is that people in Japan, in uttering these words repeatedly, may hypnotize themselves. And if ninety million people should come under the influence of mass hypnosis, something drastic could happen. We cannot hope to feel the spiritual pulse of the Japanese people today without taking into account the undercurrents of this type of potential mass hypnosis.

One of the basic problems in post-war Japan is the rootlessness of the Japanese people. Rightly or wrongly, until World War II the Japanese people had a sense of security in this universe. Their sense of security was derived not from any particular doctrine of Shinto, Buddhism or Confucianism but from the nebulous but real cosmological orientation that underlay the ancient Shinto religion. While this cosmic orientation had been submerged through the long history of Japan by the influences of the religious and cultural waves from outside, it remained at the core of the spiritual culture of Japan, transforming religions and cultures which were introduced from outside. This was astutely observed by J. B. Pratt, who stated that the Japanese people "have done with Buddhism what they have done with everything else that has been brought them from abroad. They have accepted it simply, humbly, in sincere and almost child-like fashion, and then they have laid the stamp of their own transforming genius upon it."⁶ Indeed, it was not any one of the institutionalized religions which

6. Pratt, James B., *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1928), p. 457.

gave the Japanese their sense of destiny and security in this world; it was this underlying cosmological orientation which enabled them to assimilate various religious and cultural forms without becoming schizophrenic.

The tragedy of post-war Japan is that the people have lost this religious orientation. When Japan surrendered to the Allied Powers in 1945, it was not simply the end of warfare. What Japan lost was far more than the divine prerogatives of the throne or the gigantic institution of state Shinto. These were external symbols of something much deeper, that is, the source of the Japanese sense of destiny and security based on the cosmological world-view which had been preserved from time immemorial. When the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers ordered the Japanese government to terminate the sponsorship, support, perpetuation, control, and dissemination of Shinto, "civilized" people elsewhere rejoiced that the end had come to an obscurantist magico-religion, and they praised the courage of the emperor when he repudiated the "false conception that the emperor is divine and that the Japanese people are superior to other races and are fated to rule the world." And it may be that today religious Shinto, Buddhism, and Christianity have a real opportunity to grow and develop in an atmosphere of a genuine religious liberty. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the Japanese people as a whole have lost their traditional sense of values and of the meaning of history. I am not suggesting that this radical change is necessarily a bad thing; I am saying, however, that the Japanese people are now caught off balance and are not certain in which direction they should take the next step. Caught between the Free World and the Communist World, and caught between their ancient past and uncertain future, the Japanese are blinking and rubbing their eyes in a world which is changing and moving too rapidly for their comfort. They cannot even trust their own senses, because their own image of the world has been destroyed; they are sojourners in their own country, looking desperately for some kind of

certainty, hope and faith.

This is precisely what the so-called new religious cults (*Shinko Shukyo*) claim to provide; and to a significant degree they do. Some of them have derived their inspiration from Shinto, Confucianism, Buddhism, or Christianity, but their doctrinal systems are not clearly defined because most of them are so new. In fact, many of their founders are still living today, and are still receiving "new revelations." Each sect has an independent institutional structure and trains its own teachers, many of whom are volunteers. Members, however, are not always followers of one sect exclusively; many of them shop around, as it were, and more often than not they consider themselves also Buddhists and adherents of Shinto.

Most of these sects are eclectic. Their teachings betray the influence of the more established religions. Their doctrines are characteristically very simple, they are skilfully organized, and their founders are usually charismatic leaders. Their simple teachings appeal to the masses, who do not feel at home with the complex doctrines of established religions but want simple, direct, and practical beliefs and practices. For example, the P.L. (Perfect Liberty) Kyodan teaches: (1) Everyman is the son of god; (2) Life is art; (3) The life of man is self-expression; (4) One must live brightly as the sun; (5) Men are equal; and (6) Perfect Liberty must be the aim and guiding principle for every man and woman. The skill with which these new sects are organized enables their followers to have a sense of "belonging" which they do not experience elsewhere. Newcomers are made to feel welcome, and the sects promote mutual aid and public welfare. Not a few of them operate a whole series of educational, medical and other social services, and some of them even have excellent museums and libraries. Unlike the older religions, these new sects hold services and meeting that are informal, and they make full use of group psychology. All of them are highly centralized in their structure, utilizing "cell group" system as well as "incentive plans." Some of them have

semi-militaristic disciplines and hierarchical systems. All of them use modern mass media of communication and have efficient methods of tithing.

What gives each of these sects its distinct character is the personality of the founder or organizer. Many of the founders boast unusual spiritual powers in divination, sorcery, incantation, fortune telling, and healing, which betray the "shamanistic roots" of their religious orientations; and they have the capacity to attract and maintain rapport with a large number of followers. For the most part, these sects appeal to the lower middle class, especially middle aged or older women, although some of them claim followers among the intelligentsia, the upper middle class and young people. Today about one hundred of these new religious sects are members of the "Union of New Religious Cults" (*Shin-shu-ren*).

In Retrospect

It becomes abundantly clear that the religious situation in present-day Japan is extremely complex. All too often people try to understand the modern phase of Japanese history as an appendage of the influence of the Western civilization that has penetrated Japan during the past hundred years. There is some truth in this view, of course. But we are inclined to believe that modern Japan cannot be adequately understood without reference to her historical experience, for the past is working in the present even when it is submerged.

Even such a brief discussion of the religions in Japan, past and present, presents an important problem regarding the relationship between values and history. Values do change with the passing of time, and history moves on. However, an equilibrium between values and history must be maintained; other-wise people will lose their sense of spiritual security and destiny.

It is beyond the scope of our discussion to pass any judgment as to what each religion should have done or should not have done in

Japan. We can discern, however, two approaches to this problem in the history of Japanese religions. The first approach was exemplified by Confucianism and Buddhism, which accepted the traditional equilibrium between cultural values and history in Japan. Both Confucianism and Buddhism made tremendous contributions to the spiritual culture of Japan. Confucianism provided the most articulate social and political theories as well as social and individual ethics, and Buddhism established itself as the "Half Creed of Japan." Nevertheless, both of these religions were so thoroughly assimilated and indigenized that the traditional Japanese equilibrium between values and history was not greatly disturbed. Neither Confucianism nor Buddhism demand a reinterpretation of the underlying cosmological world-view of the Japanese. Thus, there are Japanese Confucianists and Japanese Buddhists, but the core of the Japanese spiritual culture remained intact. In this respect, a statement of Ruth Benedict is significant: "It was not Buddhism and it was not Confucianism. It was Japanese — the strength and weakness of Japan."

In sharp contrast to Confucianism and Buddhism, the Roman Catholic Christianity of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the Protestant Christianity of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were more belligerent toward the spiritual culture of Japan. Hocking rightly points out that a multiform religious system such as Buddhism can add to its number or find cross-identities, while a monotheism like Christianity, professing to supply all the religious needs of mankind, calls for singleness of allegiance. Thus Christianity, both Catholic and Protestant, rejected the whole apparatus of polytheistic worship; "the temple and idols of the 'heathen' have had to fall."⁷ In so doing, Christianity tended to reject not only all the rival religious systems but also the indigenous cultural values and the historical ex-

7. Hocking, William E., "Living Religions and A World Faith," *The Asian Legacy and American Life*, ed. Arthur E. Christy (New York: The John Day Co., 1942), p. 207.

perience of the Japanese. More often than not, European and American missionaries attempted to Westernize as well as Christianize the Japanese people and culture. Japanese converts were made to feel, consciously or unconsciously, that to decide for Christ also implied the total surrender of their souls to the missionaries. The task of evangelism was interpreted by most missionaries as transplanting *in toto* the church in the West on Japanese soil, including the ugly features of denominationalism — an unhappy assumption, indeed.

The real tragedy is that Japanese Christians, who wanted to be “liberated” from traditional religions, were compelled to be “uprooted” from their culture. There were those, like Kanzo Uchimura, who seriously struggled with the problems of relating Christian faith to Japanese culture. But, all too often, those who blindly conformed to the mores of the “mission compounds” were taken as genuine converts, while those who attempted to relate Christianity to the indigenous culture and history were accused of not making a clean break with the pagan past. Even today, many Christian leaders feel it is possible to superimpose Western Christian “values” on Japanese “history,” not realizing that the Christians thus oriented would be compelled to lead a schizophrenic life, holding within themselves two contradictory and unrelated world-views.

What the future has in store for the religions in Japan we cannot say. It is fairly clear, however, that only a religion which comes to grips with the core of the Japanese spiritual culture — its underlying world-view and the relationship between values and history — can exert a significant religious influence in Japan. As in any other part of the world, genuine religions in Japan must accept and yet transcend the cultural affirmations of the underlying religious world-view.

The contemporary religious situation in Japan has profound implications for Christians who hold that God is the Lord of History. As yet many Christians believe that the meaning of life and the world

can be derived solely from the Bible and the history of the church, not realizing that the Lord of History revealed Himself in the history of Syrians and Philistines, and, we might add, the history of the Asian peoples as well.

現代日本に於ける宗教事情

ジョセフ・M・北川

序 現代に於ける日本の事情を外国から正しく考察することは必ずしも容易な課題ではない。今まで多くの人々が日本の自然や社会、経済、政治、宗教などの事情について様々な見解をとってきた。そしてこれらはその一面をとらえているとは言えるが、しかし現代日本の精神性を適切に表現しているとは言い難い。「日本ほど数多く描かれた国はないが、しかし又この国ほど充分に理解されていない国はない。」

古代神道 日本の歴史時代は大和朝廷成立の1600年頃に始まると言われている。初期の日本民族の宗教は後に「^{かんながら}惟神の道」として知られた神道であり、それは単純な自然宗教である。その宗教の中心は「かみ」に対する信仰であり、神はあらゆる自然物の中に満ちているため、すべての生命や宇宙は神聖なものとされている。古代神道の神話における「八百万の神」はこの世界の神聖性を示す表現である。

初期の日本人は自己を自然の存在や働きと切り離して考えることをせず、又この世の寄留者として画くこともしなかった。彼らは自然の一部であって、自然は単なる物の集まりではなく生命あるものの集まりであり、人間と自然とは血族関係にある。

古代神道は2つの主な性格を有している。第1は神への感謝である。人生には悲しみや恐れを伴うが、しかし全体としては善であり美であって、その運命は感謝すべきものである。第2は潔めである。古代日本人の関心は道徳的罪惡よりも寧ろ魔よけ、節制などに向けられた。惡は外的要因であり、人間自身の中に惡があるのではない。従って惡は美や調和の欠乏であるから、それは潔めの儀式（「はらい」）によって回復される。

神道は個人的信仰や確信ではなく社会性を帯びた宗教である。日本の古

代国家では政治即ち「まつりごと」と宗教的儀式即ち「まつり」とが同一視され、それらはいずれも天皇の義務とされていた。

古代社会の統合体は氏族であった。各氏族は神のもとに統治され、そこでは季節の祭りや種々の儀式が行われた。多くの氏族は特別な山を選んで「他界」としたが、死者の霊がここに行き、或いはここから帰ってくるものと信じられていた。通常高貴な人々や祭司の魂は神になると信じられた。死者の魂は氏族の生命と深く関係しており、世襲のシャーマンが氏族の中で重要な役割を果たした。

外来宗教文化の波動 外来の宗教文化が日本宗教に与えた影響を三つの時期に見ることが出来る。第1は支那文化の影響である。それは数回に亘って日本文化に同化されていったが、その結果、神道は国家的及地域的祭儀を、儒教は公私の道德を、仏教は精神的なものをそれぞれ担うに至った。しかし13世紀の蒙古襲来は日本独自の仏教をうむこととなり、日蓮宗、阿弥陀信仰、禅宗及び神道の復興を見た。

第2の外来宗教文化は16世紀におけるローマ・カトリック教の来日で1549年のフランシス・ザヴィエルの訪日に始まる。キリシタンの名で知られる彼らは単に宗教としてのみでなく西洋文化の象徴として当時の大名たちに迎えられた。トマス・ア・ケンブスの「イミタチオ・クリスティ」や「イソップ物語」などが訳され、6世紀末には約15万の信者を数えたと記録されている。しかし1637年の島原の乱は日本におけるローマ・カトリック教の華々しい歴史に終結をもたらし、その後日本は2世紀半に亘る鎖国時代に入る。この時期には神道や儒教と共に武士道が栄えた。

近代西洋文明と日本 第3の時期はペリーの来朝に始まる西洋文明の導入である。郵便、市役所、銀行、議会、軍隊、教育などすべての機構に西洋文明は採用された。長いキリシタン禁制の札ははずされ、頭髪や帯剣などの風俗が改まった。青年たちは伝統的文化や宗教から解放されて、西洋の科学、民主主義、キリスト教、無神論へあこがれた。多くの西洋の思想

家、哲学者が知識人を魅惑し、その偶像となった。

しかし10年後には、こうした熱狂的な西洋文化の迎合は1つの転期を迫られる。即ち1889年に憲法が発布されたが、文部省は神道を宗教とせず、これを国民道徳あるいは国家的儀式であるとして特別の便宜を与えた。以後、教育は民族優越の国家主義の教化と天皇崇拜の強調の具となっていた。日支事変、日露戦役、日韓併合及び第1次世界大戦は日本に未曾有の繁栄をもたらし、財閥及保守政治家の抬頭を見たが、これは同時に神道の特権的地位を保証するものとなった。天皇崇拜、神道、「大和魂」、修身などが外国思想や危険思想を圧迫する道具となった。

1930年以後、すべての自由思想が危険とされ、言論、集会、出版の自由は犯されていった。軍国主義や国家主義に抵抗した政治家たちの暗殺が起った。宗教は国家の目的に協力するよう強要され、1941年仏教、キリスト教、教派神道の各教派は1つの組織に合体して国家主義の精神的とりでとなるように命ぜられた。

戦後の日本 1945年連合軍に対する降伏以降、日本は経済、政治、文化のすべての面でアメリカの影響のもとに立った。占領軍の指令で国家神道は廃止され、天皇は神であることを放棄した。占領軍は日本を中立化し、最も進歩した民主主義に基く政治体制を作り上げた。しかし1947年以降、アメリカのアジア政策は転換して、日本を太平洋における反共戦線の1つにしていった。1951年講和、安保両条約が締結し、1960年にはその改訂を見た。日米関係の憂慮すべき点の一つは再軍備であり、人々は日本の完全軍備撤廃は占領軍の権威によったのだと主張し、一方その反対理由は多額な軍備費の負担に対するものである。日本は自由世界と極めて親しく、地域的にはソ連、中共と近く、経済的にはアジアの国々と関係を持たねばならない。こうした外的事情が日本の事情を一層複雑にしている。

戦後の宗教事情 戦後の日本の根本問題の1つは精神的支柱の喪失であろう。第二次大戦までは日本人はともかくも安心感というものを持ってい

た。この安心感は特定の宗教の教義から出たものではなく、古代神道に根深く横たわっている宇宙論的傾向によるものである。この宇宙論的傾向は日本の精神文化の中核として残存し、いつも外来宗教を自己のものに変容する働きをして来た。様々な宗教や文化を精神分裂を呈することもなく同化して来たのは、この宇宙論的傾向によるものであった。

しかし戦後、巨大な国家神道と天皇崇拜とが消えた時、日本人のこの宇宙論的世界観に根ざした運命感と安心感とは一挙に崩れ去った。宗教は解放されて自由な活動を始めたが、しかし日本人はその伝統的歴史観や価値を失った。彼らは歩むべき方向と均衡とを失い、自由世界と共産主義世界、歴史的過去と不確かな未来との間に板ばさみになって自己の内に確かさや希望、信仰を失っている。

新興宗教を明確に定義することは困難であるが、その多くは折衷宗教であり、教理は共通して単純で、巧妙な組織を持ち、教祖はカリスマ的指導者である。その単純な教理が、既成宗教の混然とした教理になじめない民衆に受け入れられる。その組織は細胞性により、コミュニケーションのための近代的マス・メディアの方法を採用している。各派の特質は教祖にあって、彼らは予言、呪術、呪文、癒しなどの異常な霊的能力を誇っている。こうした古代宗教のシャーマニズムの要素が民衆を引きつけているのである。比較的下層の人々、中年又は老人の婦人たちがそこに集まっている。今日、「新宗連」の加盟宗教は100を数えている。

結語 今日の日本に於ける宗教事情は極めて複雑であるが、これを正しく理解するには過去の歴史的推移の考察をおろそかに出来ない。

以上に述べて来た過去、現在に互る日本の宗教事情において示された重要な問題は、価値と歴史との関係である。価値も歴史も共に移り代っていく。しかしその均衡が失なわれるならば人々は精神的安定感と運命感とを失うであろう。

日本における諸宗教のあり方について、我々は2つの点に注目したい。

1つは儒教と仏教とが日本の精神文化に大きな影響を残したにも拘らず、それは十分に土着し、同化されて、日本の価値と歴史との間の均衡がくずれることなく保たれたことである。従ってそれらの中に日本の精神文化の中核は完全に保存されて来た。

これとは対照的にローマ・カトリック教とプロテスタント教会とは日本の精神文化に対して極めて好戦的であった。彼らは諸宗教の組織のみでなく日本固有の文化的価値や歴史的経験までも拒否しようとした。日本のキリスト教化は同時にその民衆と文化との西欧化であるとされ、キリストに従うとは彼らの魂の隅々まで宣教師にあげ渡すことだと感じられた。しかもこの宣教は西洋のみにくい教派主義を日本に持ちこむこととなった。

伝統的宗教から解放されることを望む日本のキリスト者は、日本の文化から追放される憂目を見る。内村鑑三のように今日までキリスト教を日本文化に関係させようと努力して来た人々はあったが、彼らは異教と全く関係を断っていないという批難を受けたのである。西洋のキリスト教的「価値」を日本の「歴史」の上にかぶせようとする試みも、結局2つの矛盾し、関係を持たない世界観のゆえに不可能である。

将来の日本がどのような宗教を備えられているかを知することは、日本の精神文化の核心——その世界観及価値と歴史との関係——をしっかりと握り締めることの出来た宗教だけが、日本に重要な宗教的影響を与えることが出来るであろうということである。(辻 建要約)

TILlich ENCOUNTERS JAPAN

Edited by Robert W. Wood

During the visit to Japan last year of Dr. Paul Tillich, a number of interesting discussions were held in limited groups with Dr. Tillich as the chief participant. The Quarterly is pleased to publish the following transcripts of two of these discussions which were arranged by Dr. Tetsutaro Ariga and Prof. Sakae Kobayashi of The Christian Center for the Study of Japanese Religions during the month of June.

The transcripts were made from tape-recordings of the discussions and have been edited only to the extent of smoothing out certain grammatical constructions. In fairness to Dr. Tillich and the participants it should be noted that the discussions were informal and were not originally intended for publication, nor have the speakers had opportunity to check or revise the content. The following material, therefore, while largely verbatim, is presented without quotation marks. It is published in these pages in order to allow a larger circle of people to "listen in" on two of Dr. Tillich's many discussions in Japan.

(The following conversation occurred on June 6, 1960 at a meeting between Dr. Tillich and scholars and students of Otani University, the Jōdō Shin Sect Buddhist university in Kyoto.)

Tillich: Earlier at our "metaphysical tea", we had a question about the relationship of living Buddhism to the historical figure of Buddha, and I asked the question, "How do the different schools of Buddhism relate themselves to the historical Buddha?" And now I want to ask the more radical question, "If some historian should make it probable that a man of the name Guatama never lived, what would be the consequence for Buddhism?" I ask this question because during my whole scholarly life I have tried to answer the question of what

would happen to Christianity if somebody could prove, in terms of probability of course, that Jesus had not lived, that a man of the name of Jesus could not be found in the police files of Nazareth in the years 1 to 30 A.D. I give the answer to what this would mean for Christianity in my theology, and I say it would not mean anything. Others would say it means everything. This is the great discussion. Now, I am for this very reason much interested in what this would mean for Buddhism.

Buddhist: No historian has ever said that Guatama did not live, so in our Buddhist sects and schools his historicity has been assumed and each school of Buddhism believes that its doctrine of enlightenment has its roots in the enlightenment Guatama himself had.

Tillich: Then I would also say that no serious historian has ever said that about Jesus either. But even if someone lived, from the standpoint of historical research we know so little about him that is probably true that this little doesn't account for the tremendous effect he had on history. And the writings which follow him can be put under serious questioning, and someone may say that they are not very reliable records of what he actually he said. Now this is the real question, and I only wanted to make it as radical as possible. For if the one is doubtful, finally someone will appear and say that the other is doubtful too. The main question is, "If history comes to the same result that it comes in people like Albert Schweitzer or Bultmann today, that our historically probable knowledge about Jesus is almost nothing, would the same result with reference to Guatama mean very much to Buddhism?" So that, for instance, every Sutra (which would be similar to the Gospels in Christianity), would be questioned as probably not giving a reliable picture of what Buddha really meant. That was the real meaning of my question.

Buddhist: Do you mean by your question, what weight does the figure of the historical Guatama have for Buddhism? If so, in Buddhism no doubt has ever been presented questioning the historical existence

of Guatama, nor in regard to Guatama's speaking of "causation". But difference in interpretation does arise as to what is the real significance of Guatama's speeches, and so each school has chosen certain Sutras which it finds most helpful in interpreting Guatama's doctrine of causation. And so the problem is, what is the relation between the particular Sutras one school has chosen and those chosen by other schools. Thus there is no absolute difference between one particular school and others. Therefore the whole problem has been put in a different way from the way it is put by Christians for whom the *oldest* documents have been made the basis of their faith in Jesus. But in Buddhism that problem has never bothered people. In contrast, Buddhists have chosen the Sutras which are most helpful to them in interpreting the doctrine of causation.

Buddhist: According to the doctrine of Buddhism, the *dharma kaya* is eternal, and so it does not depend upon the historicity of Guatama. However, your question should be seriously acknowledged instead of glossed over.

Tillich: Now I would like to ask another question. I see a great cleavage between Buddhism "on the top" — the founders, priests, monks, theologians and so on — and popular Buddhism. I have talked about this problem a very great deal since I have come to Japan, and previously in America I met and knew people like Suzuki, Hisamatsu and others. And my question is how is this thought "on the top" related to the popular beliefs of the ordinary adherent or follower of Buddhist teaching. In the Christian Middle Ages we had a similar cleavage, and there it was expressed in the doctrine of the *fides implicita* and *explicita*. Only the priests, theologians, etc., had explicit knowledge of Christianity, and the lower classes believed what the Church believed and told them. And they lived in a very primitive way. And this is partly still the case in the Roman Church. But in the 16th century a new class came into existence, the higher and lower middle classes, and they were neither "on the top" nor at the

bottom (popular religion) of the religious realm. Under the impact of this social class the Reformation arose and abolished many, if not most, of the usages which belonged to popular religion in order to make Christianity understandable for the thinking laymen of the middle class. Now my question is, "Is there in Buddhism anything which is comparable to this — a bridging between popular religion which always and easily becomes superstitious and demonized, and "the top" which is beyond the concrete and which has a direct relationship to the Buddha principle or to the Ultimate principle?" I do not see any such movement which is comparable to the Reformation in Christianity, may be ignorant about it, so I am very eager to hear but I an answer to this question from this group.

Buddhist: What do you mean by the demonization or distortion of religion?

Tillich: Many things. For instance, the identification of a special sacred object with the Holy itself — what usually is called idolatry — is one of them. For example, not realizing that a statue of Buddha points not only beyond the statue, but also beyond the historical Buddha, to the Ultimate. Or the belief that special practices, such as saying certain prayers mechanically, have an effect on divine powers for help, so that these divine powers become servants to men instead of men becoming servants to the gods. Or the identification of the Divine with mere destructiveness, as we find it in some gods or powers or rituals where the destructive element is predominant and is not conquered by the creative element. Now all of these things happen in popular religion and are often the reason why the thinking middle classes turn away from religion altogether. And so the question is, "What does the upper leadership of Buddhism do in order to overcome this and to enable the thinking middle classes to receive Buddhism?"

Buddhist: Buddhism is not a system of doctrines but is primarily an experience. So all that matters in Buddhism is to have a Buddhist experience. That is, it is something like taking a medicine;

you may not be informed of the prescription, but you may take it without knowing what the ingredients are. Buddhist literature tries to explain what it means, but this knowledge is not important.

Tillich: Well, that is precisely the *fides implicita*. Now let me ask a question in connection with this "experience". Is it possible that there is a distorted, a falsified, experience in the realm of Buddhism? That is, is there, as the Reformers said, a distorted experience, an experience which is still experience of the Holy but experienced in a distorted way, for instance in an idolatric way? This is the meaning of my question.

Buddhist: Buddhism has also had its Reformation, for instance in the case of the Shin Sect and also in the case of Zen Buddhism. Zen has de-demonized Buddhism. While in Buddhism prior to the rise of Zen and Shin there have been distorted forms of Buddhism -- magical or idolatric or demonic -- there is nothing like that in Shin or Zen. So in these latter forms Buddhism has actually been reformed. But in understanding this point it is important to note the difference between Eastern and Western history, or Japanese and European history. In the 13th century in Japan the reformation movements did not arise in connection with the life of the middle classes, while in the 16th century in Europe the Reformation did so.

Buddhist: In the West at the time of the Reformation it was the intellectuals, the educated people, who supported the Reformation. But in Japan it was not necessarily the intellectuals who supported the reformation movements of the 13th century. To be sure, Zen was much more intellectualistic and was more or less supported by the higher intellectuals, and only later did it penetrate into the lower and middle classes as these classes arose. But on the other hand, Shin Buddhism arose not among the intellectuals but among the more ignorant common people -- the peasants and lower classes. Only Shin Buddhism could get rid of the magical and demonic elements. Why? Because of its emphasis upon personal faith in the grace of

Amida Buddha. In this faith people rooted their concern in the Ultimate. And this faith, although it did not consist in intellectual understanding, yet involved certain intellectual elements such as hearing the preaching of Buddha's Law, somewhat similar to the hearing of the Gospel in Christianity. And through this hearing of the preaching of the Law the Shin Buddhist could engage in self-criticism. Thus, in this way even the peasants could have a quite deep religious experience.

Buddhist: Shinran himself, who initiated this Shin movement, had deep philosophical and metaphysical foundations to his system. Therefore, the preaching of the Law was not simply a preaching Gospel but also involved profound metaphysical implications.

Buddhist: What has been said has been from an ideal point of view, for in Shin and Zen Buddhism there is still something magical and demonic.

Tillich: This is a different question. I can understand how it is that a Jew, a Christian, or a Muslim prays, because praying always leads people to another ego, a Thou, and it is thus an ego-thou relationship. To whom does someone pray on the basis of Buddhism? I understand very well that a Buddhist can meditate, and I believe that in Christianity meditation is far too much neglected because the personal symbolism of the Divine has overlaid the suprapersonal in much Christian thinking, especially in a country like the United States where the tradition of personalism is so strong. But on the other hand, in the official doctrine and theological background of Buddhism the personal element is almost swallowed by the suprapersonal element — let's call it the Buddha principle or the Amida principle, but not a figure which can be looked at like a person. Nevertheless, there is much prayer going on. How can this be united with the fundamentals of Buddhist theory? Or, to formulate the question more precisely, "To whom does a Buddhist pray if he prays instead of meditating?"

Buddhist: In the Shin Sect, unlike other schools of Buddhism, there is not much emphasis upon meditation, and no emphasis whatsoever on prayer. Shin refuses to pray and denies the whole concept of prayer; it admits only an expression of gratitude or thanksgiving for the grace of Amida Buddha.

Buddhist: This is true in Shin but not in Buddhism in general. There are certainly prayers offered to Buddha, bhodisatvas, even to Shinto gods, but this practice has been made possible by the belief that Buddhahood has manifested itself in human form. So whatever may be the figure to whom one prays, one actually prays to the spirit of Buddha.

Tillich: I am very interested in what you say, that Shin Buddhism does not accept prayer except for the prayer of thanksgiving. The Ritschlian school in Protestant theology in the 19th century, by reason of Kantian philosophy, also said it is superstition to ask anything of God, and on this ground they criticized the prayer of supplication as asking for something, as influencing God to give something. Of course, advanced theology has always denied this interpretation and has said that the prayer of supplication means bringing one's daily life concerns into the life of the Eternal without the desire to influence it. And I would say in criticism of this Ritschlian school, and at the same time of this "escape" (I would call it) of Shin Buddhism, that even if you give thanks, you give thanks not to an "it" but always to a "thou". This does not mean, of course, that there is somewhere a Being, but that you have a vision of the Divine in personal form even when you give thanks. I will tell you a little story. A friend of my grandfather, a very rich Jew who was one of the very secular Jews one found very often around 1900, told my grandfather that he must have a God in order to thank Him when he had some great joy; he said he must have somebody to thank if he had a great joy for which he could not thank any human being, but which had been given him by Providence or destiny. And this was, so to speak,

his argument for God. Now I tell this story only because it shows that even prayer of thanksgiving includes some ego-thou relationship. In meditation you can have feelings of thanks—that can happen; but if you have a prayer of thanksgiving, then you cannot escape the personalized “thou”. (At this point the discussion closed with mutual expressions of gratitude.)

(The following discussion took place on June 7, 1960 at a meeting of Dr. Tillich with friends and supporters of the Christian Center for the Study of Japanese Religions in the Kyoto area. Dr. Tillich had been asked to begin the discussion with a few words on his concept of the “demonic”).

Tillich: If a concrete holy object is made into the Holy itself, then religion is demonized, because every finite reality which claims infinite value significance, obedience, commitment, and so on, necessarily comes into conflict with other finite realities which have the same ultimate validity and non-validity, and so the demonic is always destructive. And it is always destructive of justice. I want to introduce this word “justice” here. We do justice not only to human beings, but also to objects in nature and to ideas and to values. If we adhere, for instance, to one god in Greek mythology, to Dionysius, we do injustice to Apollo, and vice versa. And out of this injustice against the unity of the values or powers of being a destruction of the one by the other in our mind follows. This destruction expresses itself as the split consciousness.

And what is our criticism as Christians of polytheism? There is no reason why there should not be many gods. Why is the number 1 better than the number 20 or 3, as it is in many religions? There is no reason for this except the one reason that if there is not one god, then each special god claims ultimacy. And therefore the problem of polytheism is the same problem of everything demonic, namely the split consciousness.

Now this can happen on the highest level as well as on the lowest

level. It can happen in a kind of Jesus-piety which makes Jesus as an individual or finite character according to the Christian creed into an absolute. This was first done by the disciples, and Jesus reacted very strongly against them when they tried to do it. Only the crucified is absolute; this means, he who has surrendered his finitude. If we take it on the lowest level, we have the fetish, the statues, the sculptures and pictures everywhere in temples where popular piety confuses what is the Holy itself, the Ultimate, with the preliminary, namely, the wonderful Buddhist statue and so forth. In the moment in which prayer is offered to the picture or sculpture or even to Buddha as an individual being, then, of course, it is idolatry. And so I would say that the demonization of religion and its destructive consequences go through all religions. The Reformation was the great Christian attack on the demonic in the Roman Church, namely, the identification of the Holy itself with the pope; this was the attack by Luther. It was not the doctrine of justification — that was the occasion. The decisive point was in the talk at Leipzig, where the man who talked with Luther, Dr. Eck, said, "But the Councils have decided this way, so you cannot disagree." And Luther then said in the name of the Christian message itself as it is in the Bible, "I disagree." And thus the break between Catholicism and Protestantism emerged. I call this the demonic claim of the Roman Church. And when Protestant Orthodoxy did the same thing not much later, then the breaking away from this Orthodoxy was also the breaking away from an often very destructive absolutism, although the latter was not as important or as powerful as that of the Roman Church. And so we have the demonic in the whole history of religion. And here in Japan in the paganism around us we have it in a very definite way, and I will perhaps speak later on about the result of my talks with Buddhists about the demonic, and it may be very interesting. But before doing so I will first stop and get more questions about the problem.

Participant: Would you tell us what your conclusions were following

your talks with these Buddhists?

Tillich: *A priori* you should not say "conclusions". Have you ever heard any discussion come to conclusions? This was most clear in my discussion today. I had asked the following questions which I had developed before I went to the meeting. 1) How do the leading Buddhists deal with popular piety: a) in keeping it alive and making it spiritually effective; b) in countering the dangers of mechanization, superstition and demonization. 2) And then a second question which belongs to the first: Is there any event in Buddhism which is comparable to the Reformation, and any group which is comparable to Protestantism?

These were the questions, and then Mr. Hisamatsu, whom I have known and liked personally and spiritually for many years, gave the answer; but this answer was not satisfactory at all. It was that they would not call anything mechanized, superstitious or demonized. Actually, he dismissed these three concepts and said that the most primitive piety (which I would label with these three predicates) could be the way of awakening the Buddha spirit in every human being. Now in this way the whole of popular piety, if I understood him rightly, was left so much to itself without help from the religious leaders that I had a feeling my question was quite to the point and that he either could not answer it or set the question aside because it was not a problem for him.

Now this happened today, and it happened in a similar way yesterday when I had a discussion with about 20 Buddhist scholars and 50 students in Otani University. There it was very similar, for the answer was, I would say, a negation of the question.

Participant: There actually were some at those meetings who responded very seriously to Dr. Tillich's question, but they could not give any definite answer. That is the point. Some tried to dismiss the question itself, but some tried to answer it and could not.

Participant: What were your reasons for asking these particular

questions in this form rather than other questions?

Tillich: Because this is my main interest. You see, a discussion about being and non-being also occurred this afternoon, and it was in the usual manner of philosophical discussion — I could have done that in Cambridge as well as here. What I want to understand here in Japan is the actual religious power or non-power of Buddhism. I am after this all the time. And the question came to my mind the first time when I was in Kamakura. There I saw the Buddha statue and the people, and I asked myself, "How would the two Buddhists whom I know and love, Mr. Hisamatsu and Mr. Suzuki, react to this; how do they feel about this?" I was always pursuing this. For instance, in my first discussion with Buddhist scholars in Tokyo just three days after I arrived in Japan I asked the question, "Is Buddhism a *living* religion?" And this was a rather bold question to ask of Buddhist scholars. So you see my interest is not to discuss on the level of being and non-being or of pantheism and theism, but on the level of actual religious experience.

Now yesterday we had the word "experience", and one of the men answered that all of these are "religious" experiences in these popular religions. Then I asked the question whether there could be a distorted experience, and I don't know whether I got any answer to this. I do not feel that I did. And I think that what Mr. Hisamatsu said today indicates that he does not believe there is a distorted experience. If there is a religious experience, even on the lowest level or what we would call superstition, it would seem to be valid because it may be an awakening of the Buddha spirit within us.

Participant: In Zen Buddhism I was wondering if the experience which transcends being and non-being is a thing which is made ultimate. Is there thus the chance that the demonic is present on the highest level of Zen Buddhism in making the experience of transcending being and non-being into an ultimate when there really is not an ultimate in Zen?

Tillich: In this case I would be on the side of the Buddhist because I feel that a monastic discipline and meditation which has no consequences for practical life is itself a demonization of the religious sphere against the secular sphere. It is very interesting that in the Roman Church in the Middle Ages the monks were called the "religiosi"; they were those who represented religion. And Luther said against this that the maid cleaning the house is as valuable in the mind of God as all the monks together. There I see a demonization of religion. And so I would be on the side of the Buddhist who is not guilty of this sin, I would say. On the other hand, there is a danger in Buddhism which lies in the inner situation of meditation itself — that is, that the tremendous elevation of the ego-valuation, the self-conscious affirmation of oneself as being, may be identified with the Buddha spirit. This is the temptation of the saint in the Catholic Church. And it is a very frequent religious danger — making one's own ego into an absolute. Just yesterday Mr. Kobori said that this is also a tremendous danger in Zen Buddhism, that it raises the self beyond its necessary limitation. So here we have a great analogy between Catholic saintliness and Zen Buddhist saintliness — but also an awareness of the danger in both cases. For of course the Catholic penitential monks know this well — they know how dangerous it is to be a monk because of religious arrogance, which then would mean demonic possession by self-elevation, by religious arrogance, by *hubris*.

I must say, when I look at the whole situation out here, that I am grasped by the similarities between the Roman Catholic Church and all that I meet here in Buddhism, and Shintoism, so that I often wonder why Christianity has taken all this into it — how does it happen in spite of the Christian foundation of Christianity?

Participant: What sort of differences did you find between Shinto and Buddhism?

Tillich: Shinto is a riddle to me. In Shinto there are problems which I was not able to find out about. There is first the relationship to

the State and the nation, which still exists in spite of the official separation. And the fact that I was told in the Ise Shrine two days ago by the priest there that more than 50% of the nation at least once during their lifetime come to the Ise Shrine from all over Japan. Now what does this mean? I could not get this from him because my categories simply are not sufficient tools to grasp the situation here. One thing is clear; it is a religious reverence for the Emperor representing the nation, but it is religious and non-religious at the same time, and this unity is so strange. Even under Nazism this unity was only present for some crazy people; otherwise it did not exist. But I have great difficulty understanding what is going on in the peasant who comes from the northern islands with great difficulty and financial loss in order to visit this shrine once in his lifetime. Now in Catholicism and Buddhism they do the same thing, but there it is unambiguously related to divine figures. But in Shinto it is not related to divine figures; it is related to the Emperor's spirit or to the nation or something like that. When I asked about this more urgently, then it is my impression they said that of course the Emperor and the nation are representations of something more universal. One of the higher symbols is the Sun Goddess from whom the Emperor is born, but the Sun Goddess, according to what one priest said two days ago, is more a symbol of the Emperor than a real figure to which we pray. So this line, too, doesn't lead to much.

Now another line is the Shinto pantheon, and this I understand much better because there are religious motifs everywhere in the history of religions in which the divine is seen as potentially in everything and actually in special outstanding objects, events, persons, and so on, but always as representing the universe — although they don't speak of the transcendent one, except as they are influenced by Buddhism. But if they are not, then it seems to me this is much more a primitive *mana* religion — the presence of the holy substance everywhere and concentrated on special points. Now, this is my analysis up

until today, but it might be different tomorrow because the impressions come upon me like waves, and I may be wrong in this analysis.

Participant: This is another kind of question. When you analyze the religious situation in the West you have not necessarily interpreted this religious situation in terms of an organized religion, the Church, priesthood, etc. But here in Japan you seem to be concentrating on the organized religions. If you were going to be here for a much longer time would you include much more than these organized religions in your analysis of the religious situation?

Tillich: Certainly.

Participant: If this is so, is our concern as Christians primarily with our relation to these organized religions of Buddhism and Shintoism or with the broader "religious situation" as we find it in Japan?

Tillich: Of course the latter, which includes, for instance, the whole problem of secularism. You know that my interest in the West always has been in the different forms of the secular world, and I have spoken of the "latent Church" in the secular world. I believe there are similar realities in this country. But it happens that I have been confronted here only from the other side. I see the secular world in the streets, but I have not seen it from the inside. I have not had a discussion here with anyone who represented a radical humanistic or naturalistic point of view.

Participant: I have another question. We were visiting a Zen temple with a fairly important priest, and we asked him what a little Shinto Shrine was doing in his garden. He explained it by saying it was put there when the temple was built because in Buddhism we have no way of guarding against earthquake, fire, flood, or damage, and it was necessary to call upon the protection of the Shinto gods when building the temple.

Tillich: This I can only explain as that they don't care. They say even this can help to awaken the Buddha spirit. The different embodiments of the Holy don't matter at all — this is always my

impression in these discussions. I asked someone, in this regard, about Hitler (who was the divine voice or mouthpiece for believing Nazis), whether one doesn't have to fight against Hitler. And this that question caused him great distress because he felt, on the one hand, it was inhuman to say not to fight against Hitler, while on the other hand he had no theoretical foundation on which to fight Hitler as a demonic distortion of holiness. This conflict occurs if one says that everything can be a means of salvation, so to speak. This inner conflict I see in Buddhism. But I still have not heard from you whether my analysis of Shintoism is justified. What is the religious element in Shintoism? This is very confusing, and it should be one of the main points of study, for it even has political implications. Shinto is not primitivism, even though they say that they give the primitives an occasion to grasp the universe with primitive means.

Participant: My impression of modern Shinto apologies which I have seen is that they are anything but primitive. They seem to have borrowed heavily from other philosophies, ideologies, and Christian theology, and to have put together a patchwork theology which does not seem to have any organic connection with Shintoism as I understand it.

Participant: In a certain way it has this connection. But the main difficulty with Shinto is its lack of concern with moral issues. For that matter, Buddhism also lacks this concern with moral issues.

Participant: Dr. Tillich, if you define religion in terms of man's ultimate concern, what can be pointed to as distinctively religious in Shinto as over against the religion of the secular atheist?

Tillich: I know what ultimate concern is in European humanism; it is the fulfillment of all human potentialities. Or in the more radical movements of humanism, the socialist movement, it was the coming of a state of classless society or justice. And so there were always ultimate concerns, and therefore there is no irreligion. The irreligious is impossible, because even if the ultimate concern is to fight against

religion, this is a religious concern as we have always seen — that is, when one fights against religion fanatically, not diplomatically. And so we can say there is no such thing as irreligion. But then the question becomes, what should be the symbol of the Ultimate? And this leads to the different religions — why Christ (not Jesus) and not Buddha? But in Shinto I simply do not know what this ultimate concern is. In some statements it is the universe, in some it is the spirit of the Emperor, in some it is the Sun Goddess; now, what is it?

Participant: Probably part of the difficulty is that it includes all of these to some extent.

Participant: Yes, for in Shinto, *kami* may mean anything that has numenous power, whether it is a tree or a rock or anything.

Tillich: Yes, I was asked about this word *kami*. We might ask what is the *real kami*, and you would say there is no real *kami* for there are many *kami*. And so we come to the demonization of polytheism or of something transitory like the spirit of the Emperor. It is different when we speak of the universe, because there we have something which transcends every special finite. But how far it transcends, what they really mean when they say universe, whether it is *Deus sive natura*, God or nature in the sense of Dionysius Areopagitus, that I do not know.

Participant: Shinto believes in spirits which are in nature (or which are the basis of nature) and also in the spirits of the ancestors. In the theology of Shinto these spirits of nature and the spirits of the ancestors are mingled together so that these two kinds of spirit form a sort of kingdom. And to that extent we may compare the Shinto pantheon to the Greek pantheon. And thus by itself it may not be undemocratic; it *could* be democratic, except for the fact that in Shinto the spirits of the Imperial ancestors are apart from other spirits so that the whole nation is required to pay special obeisance to the Imperial ancestors. And this is the root of a possible Japanese ab-

solutism. But for this factor, the Shinto pantheon by itself would be harmless.

Participant: Is this a recent development in Shinto, or is this at its very roots? For there are periods in Japanese history when the Emperor was shunted aside completely. At these times did Shinto possess this absolutism, or is this latter something which was created in the modern period?

Participant: Even when the Imperial Household lost its actual power, the Shinto concept of the authority of the Emperor remained. But only in the period after the Meiji Restoration do we have an actual absolutism in the name of the Emperor. Prior to that there was not so much.

Tillich: May I ask a question? What does Christian missions mean here in Japan? What are its objects? This is one side of the question. The other side is, what are the methods? And the third question is, what is the aim? I would like even tentative answers so that I can see the function of the Christian missionaries and the existing Christian churches in Japan, which I do not yet see. I see them as little enclaves — little islands in the ocean. But this is not what they want to be.

Participant: I think anyone would hesitate to answer your question because there is no authoritative answer that is set up by any church or body. A conversation occurs to me which I had this afternoon with a Christian pastor who was saying that he felt the responsibility of the Church in Japan was to create persons of outstanding moral and spiritual character — people who would, by the strength of their beings, transform Japan. I think this is one definition — which is saying that the object is individuals and behind them the whole nation; that the methods are primarily the encounter of person with person within the context of the Church which serves as a nourishing community.

Tillich: This “within the Church” means not with people outside,

with Buddhists and so forth?

Participant: This pastor represents one large tradition in the Japanese Church, the Presbyterian tradition — that nurture for him comes within the fellowship of the Church, although he is not completely enmeshed within the life of this Church but is called to stand as a person within society and be constantly engaged in the office, factory, school, and political arena with others. He spoke specifically of the necessity of having conversations with Buddhists, but his primary concern at that point was to come to an understanding of the Gospel which would be somewhat determined by the life of the nation in which we stand. Buddhism represents the tradition of Japan in many way. We cannot have a true Christian message which is separate from it. You ask for the aim of this. I think the aim certainly is the development of persons who stand in an eternal dimension, and the transformation of the nation. I think this is one definition of what the mission of the Church is in this country, although it is certainly not the only one.

Tillich: Are there others?

Participant: Before I came to Japan, you met with some missionaries at the Yale Language School and I remember that you said, "You aren't taking the Kingdom with you; the Kingdom is already there." That is, the Kingdom has come, even though no one has spoken about it. I am afraid that for me, if this were true, there would be no reason for being here. Somehow or other, in thinking about the Cross, it doesn't seem to make sense unless there is separation, such a great separation, between creation and God that at one time it had to be bridged — and it was bridged by Jesus. Now there again I find that the historical Jesus is very important to me, and that if we lose him we have nothing really — we would no longer have the power that the Christian message has. It is in this context, that this man bridged this gap, that power, new power, came in. And therefore I think that our task is to expose people to the one who bridged the gap because through him this new power can come. Perhaps this

runs the risk of becoming demonic because of this person in the center. But if this Kingdom is just here, whether or not the one who bridged it is known, I don't see any sense for the Christian movement coming to a foreign country.

Tillich: I don't think this is the alternative. The Kingdom of God is fighting in history everywhere. It is fighting in the tremendous inner spiritual experiences of the Buddhists as well, and even in primitive peoples sometimes, or perhaps even more so there. But the *criterion* is lacking. And I would call "Jesus as the Christ" the criterion for the Kingdom, and this criterion is the ultimate victory over the demonic powers. I think that the need of the missionary enterprise is to say this. I believe there could not be special revelation if there were not universal revelation, and that everywhere the Kingdom of God is fighting. But in the figure of Christ, the criterion for the victory and the victorious power have come.

But when I say this, is it possible simply to think in terms of converting individuals into the Christian Church? Is this the only way, or are there other ways? And this would bring us from the question of the aim to the second question, the tools. Here my anxiety is a double one. The one is that it is impossible to bring American or Swiss or German Christianity to Japan. If you do that, you do something which simply must be resisted by such a highly cultivated nation as the Japanese nation. How can they subject themselves to the much less highly developed American civilization? It is impossible! This is one part of my anxiety. The other is the Biblical orthodoxy which I have a feeling Mr. Hendrik Kraemer advertised in the name of Barthianism. I think these two ways are to be avoided. The one is the way of orthodox preaching which doesn't even ask what the categories of reception are in the people. The missionaries to the Greeks and to the Hellenistic world asked very clearly what kind of categories could be used. Paul says that directly — becoming a pagan to the pagans and to the Jews a Jew. That is the one

side. And therefore I ask for a way which is neither the way of American civilization, including Christianity, nor the way of a Biblical orthodoxy which cannot be received because the organs for this kind of language do not exist. What is the way between them?

Participant: Most of us here are as fearful as you about the dangers of importing an American or Continental Christianity — we wrestle with this problem daily. But where and how do we come to grips with this culture? Again and again you return to the question of our relations as Christians with Buddhists and Shintoists. But can we enter by this door? For it seems to me that the effective religions, the real ultimate concerns, of most people in Japan are not expressed so much in terms of these organized religions as in terms of something similar to what is found in the West, that is, a kind of secularism. Instead of looking first to these organized religions, we see more clearly when we look for the effective religions here — when we encounter man as man and not man as a Buddhist — when we meet man as man and man in this culture with all of its needs, virtues, illness, concerns. The object is man as man — and what is introduced is not Christianity as an ambiguous amalgam of Western culture, but Christianity as the dialogue between man and the Lord of man, Jesus Christ. This, it seems to me, is the area of real encounter, and not the encounter of Christianity with these other religious systems as systems.

Tillich: How can you manage this? If you speak to somebody, a businessman, let us say, as a missionary you always represent a religion — you don't represent business as a Christian, but you represent the Church as a Christian. I could imagine that a Christian businessman could speak with another businessman, and that this matter then would be easy. But if you speak, then the question of religion cannot be eliminated, because you are a minister.

Participant: But is this not the same problem you faced in Germany in the 1920's as you sought to open up a dialogue between Christianity

and culture, with the socialist movement, and to interpret it religiously to itself? You did not enter first into dialogue with the organized religious institutions themselves which you often criticized as heteronomous.

Participant: I would like to endorse what has just been said by giving an explanation of our concrete situation, because I am a Japanese who has become a Christian. Our traditional religions, both Buddhism and Shinto, claim they are religions of the people. Shinto has always been regarded as the real religion of the nation, and also during the Tokugawa period all Japanese subjects had to register in Buddhist temples in their communities. So both Shinto and Buddhism claim practically the whole nation as their adherents. But the fact is that modern Japanese, practically the majority of them, have drifted away from their ancestral religions. So many young Japanese today are quite free from their ancestral religions, and they are spiritually lost. They are not bound to any particular religious tradition consciously. Of course, whenever they are asked what their religion is, they always answer that their families are Buddhists or Shintoists. But very seldom does one answer that he or she is a Buddhist or Shintoist. That is the general situation in which we find ourselves as Japanese. So when the Gospel of Jesus Christ is presented to the Japanese people, it means that the Gospel is presented to an individual of the secular world.

Participant: But even if people may not consider themselves affiliated with Shintoism or Buddhism, just as when the Westerner leaves the Church the psychological bent of his past history stays with him, so even when you are talking with the secular man in Japan you have to know about Buddhism and Shintoism in order to speak relevantly to him, because he still carries these things with him.

But I want to ask Dr. Tillich if we don't have to swim against the stream as Christians no matter where we are. I don't see why the problem is limited to Japan. You yourself said in one of your

lectures how thoughtful Americans are fighting the depersonalization of advertizing. Concerning this idea that to bring something in that is foreign is bad, I wonder if the Christian faith isn't always a "fist" and if you aren't always having to fight your way, whether you belong to a country that has supposedly had the Christian faith for centuries or whether you are a member of a nation where the dominant religious traditions are different.

Tillich: I would agree. You see, I wrote in the last chapter of my latest book, *The Theology of Culture*, on how to communicate the Gospel, about this problem of the offense of Christianity. And I agree that there always must be offense. But the real method of communication is to put the wrong offenses aside and to bring the people before a real decision, not a decision about some elements of German or American culture or about some special theological tenets, but about the real decision for and against the ultimate which is really the Ultimate. Now if you can do this, then I think this problem is solved as far as it is humanly possible. So I agree about the offense in the Gospel. But now we come to the point, in the West as well as here, as to what is the justified offense and what is the unjustified offense. I would, for instance, say it is unjustified to claim that one must accept the doctrine of the Trinity or the doctrine that Jesus was the Son of God and to throw them as stones at the heads of people, for both are completely misunderstood even by theologians. Now that is not the right offense. But the right offense is to accept the demand of ultimate seriousness, of the Ultimate, as it is seen in the picture of Jesus in the Gospels. Now I am afraid that one side brings wrong offenses in terms of a completely observed orthodoxy, and the other side in terms of moral and conventional attitudes of Protestant moralistic Christianity as we have it especially in America. And I would say that if you have, for instance, the problem of smoking and drinking and such American nonsense, I would say it is incredible to bring this to Japan.

Participant: Would you call it a "stone" to ask for a personal decision or commitment or affirmation to the Lordship of Christ?

Tillich: If you say it in that way, I do not even know what it means. I mean that is such a complicated, half-pietistic, half-orthodox phrase that I simply do not know what it means. "Lordship" can mean complete heteronomy, and if it means heteronomy I would reject it as demonic indeed. But it can also mean the acceptance of Him who said, "My yoke is easy . . ." — that means there is no heteronomy. And these are two completely different interpretations of this phrase. So you see how difficult this is; it is much more difficult than such a formula would indicate.

Participant: Is it allowable, then, in talking with a Buddhist?

Tillich: I wouldn't speak to any Buddhist about the Lordship of Christ, because I wouldn't even say it to an American Christian.

Participant: Would you use it in the way that *you* interpret it?

Tillich: It wouldn't be a kind of formula (which is rather indigestible — such as the phrase "Jesus is the Son of God"). These are impossible formulations which must be completely and newly taught and interpreted; and if they are not, then they are the *wrong* offenses. There must be a decision; I do not want to escape the decision. But I want only to escape formulas which make the negative decisions so easy.

Participant: Yes, but content must be put into the term Christ. And I would like to ask what content is put into it.

Tillich: Now that depends upon the discussion. In America we have a Christian secularism; here we have Buddhist and Shintoist secularism. Every secularism is dependent upon the religious tradition, even as Greek secularism was dependent upon Dionysius and Apollo (although these gods long ago disappeared as gods, but their power was still in Greek secularism) in the philosophical attitude and the ecstatic attitude of the Greeks. So we have the same thing here. And we have to find out where you can bring people before the right decisions.

Now that is what I do in my home missions or apologetics in the colleges and universities when I teach and preach. And I think that could be done here in a different way, in view of the fact that here the substance of secularism is not Christian nor Greek but something else. It is the Buddha or some other thing. Now how can the Christian message penetrate into this secularism in such a way that the people are really put before existential decisions, decisions where they are not asked to kill their intellects (for these last are demonic decisions) but to give their ultimate concern to the really Ultimate? That is what has to be done, as well as to show that what they have is not really the Ultimate.

ティリッヒと日本との出会い

ロバート・W・ウッド

(1960年6月6日に、浄土真宗の大谷大学で行われた会合からの集録)

ティリッヒの第一の質問は釈迦の歴史性に関する事柄で、もし釈迦の歴史的事実性が疑われるとすれば、それは仏教にどのような結果を及ぼすと考えられるかと言うものであった。

仏教においては釈迦の歴史性並びに彼の言説の歴史性について疑いののはさまれることはなかった。しかし釈迦の言説の真の意義がどこにあるかを廻って異なる解釈が起り、どの経典を選択するかによって宗派の特質が定まった。しかしそれは絶対的相異ではない。仏教の教理は永遠性であり、釈迦の歴史性に依存するものではない。

第二は仏教の真理と直接的関係にある上層部と、民間信仰を持つ下層部との隔たりに関するものである。キリスト教においては16世紀に新しい中間層が興って、宗教改革により俗信の慣習を廃棄した。しかし仏教においてはその隔たりを結ぶ橋はあるであろうか。

16世紀の西洋における宗教改革は知識人によって支えられた知的なものであった。しかし13世紀の日本の宗教改革は必ずしもそうではなかった。禅宗は始めは知識人に支持されたものであるが、後に次第により低い中間層に浸透していった。一方、真宗は農夫や下層民の間に起ったのである。真宗は呪術的魔力的なものを伴っているが、それは阿弥陀仏の慈悲に対する信仰の強調から来たもので、この信仰により民衆は究極的存在と関わるのである。実に民衆は戒律の教説を聞くことにより、深い宗教的経験に入ることが出来る。

第三に、ティリッヒは仏教における祈りの対象について質問した。キリスト教、ユダヤ教、回教では祈りは「我と汝」の関係であり、神の人格的

象徴性が超人格性を圧倒しているために冥想は軽視されるが、仏教の一般的教理では人格的要素は超人格的要素によって弱められている。しかし矢張り祈禱が続けられているわけであるが、その仏教的理論の根拠は何であろうか。冥想に代って祈る場合の対象は何か。

真宗は祈禱に関するすべての概念を拒否する。唯阿弥陀仏の慈悲に対して感謝の表現をすることを許すのみである。しかし他の仏教では仏陀に対して祈禱を捧げるが、これは仏性が人間的形態の中に姿をとっていることを信じる信仰に基づくものである。

ティリッヒはこれに対して更に次のような意見を述べた。真宗が感謝の祈禱を除く祈願を受入れないという事は甚だ興味深い。しかし感謝を捧げる時、それは「もの」に対してではなく「汝」に対してなされる。勿論、それはどこかに「唯一の存在者」がいることを意味しないが、感謝に際して人々は、人格的形態において神的存在の幻影を持つのである。そこでは人格的な「汝」から逃れることは出来ないであろう。

1960年6月7日に、諸宗教センターの関係者との間に行われた会合からの集録)

ティリッヒ博士は始めに「悪魔的」という概念について意見をのべた。究極的な、聖なるものが具体的な、聖なる対象物として現われる時に、宗教は悪魔化される。そこでは、すべての有限的存在が自己の有限的価値を主張し合う結果、悪魔的なものはいつても破壊的とならざるを得ない。多神教においては各々の神が究極性を主張する。従って多神教の問題は悪魔的なものの問題であり、分裂意識の問題となる。

聖なるものの対象化は、宗教の高度な段階ではたとえばイエスの個人性、有限性を絶対的とする敬虔さの中に現われ、低い段階では迷信・偶像などの中に現われている。宗教の悪魔化とその破壊的帰結とはすべての宗教に共通して存在している。宗教改革はローマ教会が悪魔化し、法皇と聖なるものとを同一視したことに對する攻撃であった。しかし、その後のプロテ

スタント正統主義は同じ経過をたどり、正統主義からの離脱はその破壊的な絶対主義からの離脱であった。日本の異教世界の中にもそうした悪魔的なものが、非常に明確な形で現われている。

悪魔化という方向で問題をとらえることは私の主な関心事である。日本においても私は真の宗教的力や仏教の無力性の方向について知りたいと思っている。私は「仏教は生きた宗教であるか」という大胆な質問を仏教学者に向けたが、それを汎神論や神観のレベルではなく、真の宗教的体験のレベルで論じようとしているのである。ところが仏教の人々は、低い偶像礼拝の段階を機械化されたもの、偶像、悪魔化されたものと呼ぼうとはせず、それは曲げられた宗教体験ではなくて、凡ての人に仏陀の霊を呼び起す原始的敬虔であると言っている。

禅宗の冥想においては、自己評価の高揚と自己意識の主張とが仏陀の霊と一致するという危険がある。自己がその必要な制限を越えて高揚するところに禅宗の大きな危険があり、ここにカトリックの聖徒におけるものと、の類似があると思われる。私はキリスト教的基盤から何故そうした悪魔的なものを所有することになるのかを度々考えさせられている。

神道は私にとって謎であり、未解決な点が多い。そこには国家や国民との結びつきが強く存在している。民衆の大半が、多額の経済的負担を払って伊勢神宮に参拝することは、カトリックや仏教におけるような神像崇拜と違って、むしろ天皇の霊や国家と結びついたものらしい。神社において見られるものは宗教史のいたるところに見出される宗教的動機、すなわち神がすべての事物に潜在的であるという原始的マナ宗教である。神道において究極的関心が何であるかについては明確に分らない。

神の国は歴史のいたるところでたたかっている。それは仏教徒の内的経験の中でも、原始的経験の中でもたたかっている。唯、そこには基準(criterion)が欠けている。イエスはそうした神の国の基準であり、悪魔的諸力に対する究極的な勝利である。宣教の業の必要性はこれを語ることに

ある 世界的・一般的啓示なしには特殊啓示はあり得ないであろう。

福音が文化と関わる際の真の方法は、間違った攻撃を廃除して、人々を真の決断の前に立たせることである。ドイツ文化やアメリカ文化の一要素や特殊な神学的教義に関する決断ではなく、究極的なものに対する真の決断である。たとえば、三一論やイエスが神の子であるという教理を受入れなければならないという主張は正当ではない。それは人々の頭に石を投げつけることである。正しい攻撃とは究極的なものの要求を受入れることである。それは福音書のイエスの描写の中に見出すことが出来る。

(辻 建要約)

HENDRIK KRAEMER AND THE CHRISTIAN ENCOUNTER WITH JAPANESE BUDDHISM

by L. Newton Thurber

Considerable stimulation was given to the concern of the Christian Church in Japan for its encounter with Japanese religions by the visit of Dr. Hendrik Kraemer. The famed Dutch theologian stressed the need for dialogue between the Church and Japanese culture and religion. He called the Japanese Church to a constant concern for real indigenization of its life and message into the life and thought of Japan. The Christian community was challenged to prove by word and act that the Biblical message is the real answer to the real human predicament in Japan.

As an example of what Dr. Kraemer means by encounter with Japanese religions a transcript is here presented of his conversation with Buddhist scholars, including Dr. Daisetz Suzuki and Dr. Daiei Kaneko, at Otani University in Kyoto last October. Dr. Kraemer began by saying:

I am very grateful for the way in which Professor Yamaguchi has welcome me. I feel a bit embarrassed because I had the idea that I would meet a very small group of great scholars in the field of Japanese religions and now I see a whole class before me and am reminded of the days when I was a professor and had to teach such classes.

The first thing I have to say is, of course, that I am sincerely grateful for the fact that you all have been so kind to take the trouble and time to enable me to meet with you. There probably are so many foreign visitors who want to ask you questions and you can not

always be available for answering questions of too-curious foreigners.

There are here before us some printed notes. I want to explain that I have written these at the request of Mr. Sakae Kobayashi who said that it was your wish that I should do that—that I should put in writing the questions that were on my mind. That is the whole reason why I have done this. Not that there are not other questions but I think this is enough for the time available.

In order to understand my purpose, I must say that I am here in Japan, as you probably know, in the interest of the Christian churches of Japan. At the same time, I have been professor of the history of religions at the University of Leiden and have, to a great extent, lived my life in eastern countries. This being the first time that I am in Japan, I am simply coming here, in regard to the Japanese world of culture and religion, to try to understand better what I already known partly on the basis of study of books in foreign languages. Therefore, when I got the request from Mr. Kobayashi to put down very briefly what was my aim I first expressed my opinion in general about Buddhism. in the second place asked a question about Jōdō-Shū Buddhism in its relation to Christianity and, the third request was from your side to formulate some questions, which I have done. And, therefore, you have this paper before you. But you are, of course, free to do what you like with it.

The chairman asked me to say a few words by way of introduction to our conversation about Buddhism. Buddhism in general is one of the most important and one of the most impressive, not only religions but systems of thinking that has manifested itself in the world in the history of the human race. As to Japan, it is very clear that it has been, at any rate in the past, one of the greatest spiritual and cultural factors that has molded Japan, and is still a considerable factor in present Japan. I have formulated here a question which is often on my mind and to which I have no sure answer. Often when studying about specific forms of Japanese Buddhism I have the feeling 'Has

that not changed considerably in comparison with what was the original sense, meaning and substance of Buddhism?' Because the Japanese, as is well known, are great masters at taking over from the outside ideas and forms, and immediately shaping them in their own way. Such a Japonizing process, it seems to me, has also occurred in Japanese Buddhism. Now the main question is 'Is Japanese Buddhism, as I say here a bit strongly, mainly a Japonization in the form of Buddhist concepts and forms or is it a faithful translation in Japanese forms of Buddhism as it was originally intended?'

I shall give an example. I have lived many years in Java. Java is a Moslem country, as you know. Nearly all the inhabitants are Muslims. That must often be said with emphasis because of the existence of such famous temples as Borobudur and so on there are many educated people, at least in the West, who think that Java is mainly Buddhist, but it is really Muslim. But the Javanese, just as the Japanese, are a very peculiar people. They have also an outstanding gift which gives immediately to every thing that they take up and absorb their own form and their own kind of expression. They were, before Islam came, rather deeply influenced, as you know, by India in its Hindu and its Buddhist forms.

Now, at the present time, you have a movement which existed since Java became Muslim, that is strongly mystical. When you analyze it you go back to the extreme mysticism of ibn-al-Arabi, one of the great mystics of Islam and you go back even to neo-Platonism as a philosophy. These people find Islam in its orthodox forms a prison which they don't like. But, nevertheless, they have not left Islam. They adhere to Islam and they have simply come to express Islam in new forms that are strongly mystical and which are, at the same time, typically Javanese, with even a strong pre-Hindu Javanese background. That they call Javanese and they openly say when you talk with them, 'Oh, yes, we don't think about believing in Islam. Why trouble about that. Certainly we are not good Muslims and

don't desire to be'. There you have a phenomenon that is rather striking. A re-translation, so to speak, of Islam into a thorough mystical form not only borrowed from mysticism as you have it in the Arab and Moslem world but also from their own original Javanese ideas. They feel themselves as being specifically distinct from what is officially called Islam. And, therefore, they themselves openly call it Javanese.

Now a bit in that sense I was always occupied with the question, 'In how far is Buddhism in Japan more a form of Japonism or is it really Buddhism expressed in a typically Japanese way which is always the right of the people to do? If all peoples were to express things in the same way then we would have a very monotonous world. Happily we have a diverse world.

Professor Emeritus Kaneko of Otani University answered the question as follows:

I believe that the basic problem is in the meaning of development. We must primarily examine not the form but what are the true principles of original Buddhism and are they found in Japanese Buddhism? In Buddhist doctrine the most important concept is that of *nirvana*. In Zen and in Shin-Shū stress on the essential nature of *nirvana* enables us to say that they are thoroughly Buddhistic. However, in original Buddhistic teaching Buddha, *Shaka*, opened the way for individual enlightenment. In Japan and in Shinran's Shin-Shū this become the possession of all, not an individual thing but the possession of the common people. There are various opinions about Japonization but, I think it is a fact that in Japan we combine the concept of 'mine' or 'private' (*Shi-yū*) and 'common' (*Kyō-yū*) into a unique understanding of 'public' (*ōyake*). This concept of 'public' is usually understood to be in tension with 'me' or 'mine' but rather the idea of 'me' and 'common' come together and live within the understanding of 'public'. Thought about the 'public' undoubtedly developed from the concept of the family, the house. What has come from it is an

understanding that the world is made up of brothers, that humanity is one family, an idea of 'public' that is rather forgotten today. I think this is Japonization, that it is the concept of 'public' which forms the 'me' and the 'holy'. Also within this understanding of 'public' there is no contradiction between freedom and equality. In Shinran's Shin-Shū the teaching centering around the word 'great' (*dai*) is only completely understood in the light of the 'public'.

Related also is the Japanese expression for 'I thank you' (*arigato*). I understand that in no other language is the relation of 'thanks' expressed without the subject 'I' nor the object 'you'. *Arigato* does not express the relation between the 'I' and the 'you' but rather the self finds itself within the atmosphere of thankfulness. This concept of relationship can be said to be prior, coming from the concept of the 'public'. Coming from this is the 'thankfulness' and within it is found the self and the other.

It is within this Japanese way of thinking that Buddhism has flowed and been Japonized if one wishes to use the word. However, it is on the basis of this thought that, undoubtedly, such concepts as 'karma' or 'causality' (*innen*) for the first time became clear. Thus it became possible to thoroughly apply the concept of 'karma' and to seek to look at all things from the perspective of 'karma'.

Dr. Kraemer replied then that:

It is time for me to react in order to carry forward to conversation. I am very thankful to Prof. Kaneko and Prof. Nishitani for the explanation of the significance of *arigato* and of the significance in Japanese thinking of the 'all sentient being' that can, of course, lead to a fundamental feeling of a sort of world brotherhood. Now before saying a word about that I will speak about some of the reasons that led me to put the question of how far Japanese Buddhism deviates from original Buddhism. By original Buddhism I mean what were the fundamental creative ideas in the *dharma* presented by the Buddha.

I am quite aware that, as Prof. Kaneko has said, in Japanese

Buddhistic thinking, as is true generally in Mahayana thinking, *nirvana* is very central. What has remained very obscure to the present day, I must say, is that in the *dharma* as enunciated by the Buddha not only is *nirvana* central but *samsara* and *karma* are also very central, because they are the indispensable presuppositions toward the development of the idea of *nirvana* as being the real relief, the real salvation, the real enlightenment. I always had the feeling in my reading that *samsara* and *karma* seem not to have played a determinative role in Japanese Buddhistic thinking whereas in the original *dharma*, they are very central and determinative. That is one of the reasons why I was always questioning about it.

Although it is not wholly a matter in the realm of ideas, but related to the realm of ideas, is the question of the form in which Japanese Buddhism has been manifested in Jōdō-Shū and Shin-Shū. There you might say the whole relation of monk and laity (if I may so call them) is different from the whole view of the relation of monks and laity in original Buddhism. We are using the terms monk and laity and I always feel it is a bit Europeanizing if we translate it that way. Strictly speaking, if I understand Buddhism a right only the monks were the *sangha*. The *uphasaka*, could get a bit nearer to the possibility of also belonging as a monk to the real *sangha* by paying kind service to the *sangha* of the monks. As you, for instance, look at the development in Jōdō-Shū and Shin-Shū there I got, even as a foreigner, the impression the laity has become far more important than the *sangha* of the monks which is rather a revolutionary change. Also, if I have studied right, Japan has been rather daring in that monks in the Shin-Shū Sect can be married which reveals quite another idea for what purpose you are a monk than in the original *dharma*. I am only asking this not in order to have a controversy but in order to see if I understand it. I am simply giving accounts of my reason why I am thinking "Is it Japonism? or is it Bdddhism?"

Then to come to the very important point of not so much putting the emphasis on the 'I' but on the 'all sentient being'. Then I would have to put the question 'How does that work for the position, (I mean not only the theoretical but the practical position in the present world) of Buddhism towards the pressing political and social problems which not only Japan has but the whole world has? The world is not changed by theory. The world is changed by dynamic theories converted into dynamic acts.

Now in a few days there will appear a book of mine under the title "World Culture and World Religion — the Coming Dialogue". The reason why I am here is that I am interested in dialogue with representatives of the great world religions and cultures because I am convinced of the coming meeting of the great religion and cultures. They have not really met each other till the present. The great meeting is still coming and now the great responsibility of all thinking people and all who feel world responsibility and who belong to the great religions is that such a dialogue take place in a really worthy form and not in controversy which leads to nothing but estrangement. And we do need the opposite of estrangement from each other in the present world.

Professor Kaneko replied :

Of course, we can look at Buddhism in its later development from the perspective of its original form. But it is also possible to take its whole development as a unity and from this prospective look at its earlier and its later developments. Of the original an unexpected amount can be seen in the latter. How the flower becomes a fruit can not be understood by only studying the processes of change. There is no question that there is change but it can be studied with great detail without really knowing what is the unchanging that underlies the flow from flower to fruit. This cannot be known except by intuition.

And now for the problem of *karma*. The concept *karma* plays

a very important role in Jōdō-Shin-Shū. There are many expressions which are used to convey the meaning of transmigration.

In connection with the problem of *sangha* (the order of disciples or monks) the concept of karmic relation has had a deep influence as has the idea that all men are brothers. To think of the *sangha* separately from these concepts is to think of Buddhism from the point of view of the leaders only. In Japanese Jōdō the relation of leader and follower is like that of the previously mentioned relation of the subject and object of *arigato* which exist by being placed within a certain unity. I failed to mention it before but when seen in the midst of human relations the 'I' and the 'you' are inter-related: the 'I' gives birth to the 'you', and from the 'you' the 'I' is born. The self and the other are not ultimately separate but are beings that are in responsive relation to each another. Similarly, *sangha* is, of course, a part of the *karma* but causality in Buddhism has the meaning of human *karma*. Someone has said that there is no need to register membership in Buddhism because having the consciousness as a human being is sufficient. Within the *karmic* relation, on the basis of having a self-awareness we have the *sangha*. Shinran sought to express the selfhood of those who were not in the *sangha*, who are not the leaders. I think this is the relation of God and men. I don't know much about your God but the universal Buddha seeks to express himself in something on earth. The earthly being seeks to find itself within the great spirit of Buddha. Within this reciprocal relation the whole is to come to a self-consciousness and as much as possible the human circle is to become the circle of Buddhism. This is the thought that comes out of Shin-Shū. Other religious bodies are well organized but in Shin-Shū organization is very loose. It is a characteristic of Shin-Shū that its organization is not much more than a fellowship of like-minded persons, all of whom are equal brothers.

"What are your main objections to Christianity?" Because of the shortness of time it was decided to consider next this fourth question

of Dr. Krämer, Dr. Daisetsu Suzuki, famed Zen scholar answered by saying: I have nothing to object to, I just can not accept Christian doctrine. Let Christians have what they like — let Buddhist have what they like. Let us agree to disagree so we go on peacefully. One thing I can not accept in Christianity is their dualistic view of existence. They make too sharp a distinction between divinity and humanity and they think God commands, and man obeys. I don't like this legalistic idea of God as commander, as creator and men as being commanded and obeying and therefore when men do not obey what they call divine commands men are punished. I most strongly do not like this idea of punishment. Judaism and Christianity are both legalistic. Christianity did not like the way of Judaistic legalism. Christ came and proclaimed the gospel of love. Love is very fine, indeed. I am in complete agreement with Christ. But Christ could not eliminate this legalistic residual of Judaistic thought. According to my way of thinking, love ought not to be relative, love ought to be absolute. If it is real love, love can not make any distinction between so called sinners or non-sinners. Rain falls on the just as well as the unjust, or we can say on the unjust as well as the just. This word 'justice'. I don't like it either. There is no justice. We can not judge each other. God, Christians say, God judges. We are not judges, human beings are not judges. But how could men conceive that God is a judge unless men judge each other which I do not like.

Now another thing about Christ's own teachings. Christ would say if one strikes the right cheek, (or left cheek, I forget, but that does not matter), turn the other. Here is something not quite innocent. Here is something discriminating, that I don't like. If a Buddhist were struck on the right or left cheek he would just accept it and wouldn't turn the other cheek. This is real love. There is another thing Christ says, "love your enemy." Buddhism would say there is no enemy. When you say love of an enemy in distinction from friends there is a certain thing which I can not conceive of as absolute love.

That is one thing. And then when divinity and humanity are forced, so strongly distinguished, there is what Dr. Tillich would call participation. I do not like participation. Love is a total thing. Love can never be divided into parts. If God loves, that love must be whole, totalistic. If man loves God that also can not be particularistic. But that does not mean that God and man are identical. I don't like the word identical either. I would say that God is God and man is man. They are quite distinct. At the same time God is man and man is God. This is the most important part. ♡

I would like to emphasize another thing which more or less is becoming concrete. I would like to mention the idea of Christ being crucified. This idea of crucifixion is the climax of the dualistic conception of existence which is within Christianity. Crucifixion means annihilation of the human nature in Christ, I suppose. I am not quite sure, though. To be sure this word of salvation is not in my conception of existence, either. But I will pick a different time to explain. When Christ is crucified they made too much of the crucifixion and from the psychological point of view, a certain amount of the element of sadistic impulse is demonstrable there. That also means too much corporality and we must drink Christ's blood and eat his flesh in order to be saved. That is symbolic, no doubt, but, at the same time, why eat Christ's flesh and why drink Christ's blood. We can get along without appealing to that kind of sadistic symbolism. That may be said too strongly but I like to express myself quite frankly.

I would like to say it is this Mary idea that I like the best in Christianity. That is the most satisfactory symbolic expression of love. I understand the Italian writer, Papini, tells of once when Christ came around to examine how Peter was guarding the Kingdom of Heaven against the intrusion of sinners. He found many of the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Heaven were not worthy to be there. So he asked Peter 'Why do you let all those people in the Kingdom of Heaven? You must be more strict about allowing only the real

Christians into the Kingdom of Heaven!' But Peter is reported to have said that 'I am quite strict and a good guard. But the main fault is with your mother, Mary. When she sees sinners approaching, to ask for permission to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, Mary is very busy and takes them all in through a window below the main gate. That is the reason why you find many unworthy inmates in this Kingdom of Heaven. I like that idea very much.

And another thing is Mary's ascension to heaven while alive. Scientifically, perhaps, objectively speaking, where is heaven anyway? And what will she be doing in heaven? Her mission is on earth not in heaven. But I like that idea just as much as her somewhat indiscriminate giving of permission to anyone who appeals to her. My idea of Mary is that she represents great love. And love can not be realized on earth. It is only in heaven and heaven may be anywhere, heaven may be anytime. I mean at the end of the world, if there is any ending of the world at all. That is the time real love is to be realized. But our mission on earth is to try to practice and realize absolute love on earth while living, not in any other place. In that case, earth will turn into heaven. Though that time will never come but we must endeavour to realize it.

Dr. Kraemer continued the conversation by saying :

I am grateful that Dr. Suzuki, whose presence I appreciate particularly because of his great age, wanted to go into this question of the objections to Christianity. Now we cannot solve that question in the remaining five minutes. Before saying a few words at least, on it, I want first to say to Professor Kaneko that certainly there is a legitimacy in looking at the original form of Buddhism or Christianity, or Islam in the light of the later developments. Certainly, because in their development, there are manifested all kinds and ways of expression that are not immediately presupposed as being present in the origin. To take from the Christian field some examples. I can not immediately say that you can read out of the New Testament

the figure of St. Francis of Assisi which was a later development. Or to mention a contemporary man you also can not read out of the New Testament, for instance, such a remarkable, dynamic figure in the field of real, practical showing of love as the well-known Pastor Boddelsweel, who when the soldiers at the order of Hitler came to kill the disabled children he had in his institutions, simply said: 'Standing before God, only over my corpse do you get into these institutions.' And they retreated. I believe this is in the New Testament in the origins but nobody should have imagined that it would have taken that particular form. Therefore, there is a legitimacy for it. But I want to say one thing. It is very peculiar that in all other religions, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, yes, perhaps with exception of Hinduism, when there is a deep urge after a real reformation then the first move is return to the roots, not in order to bind themselves, but to find the criteria.

Now Dr. Suzuki has brought up a lot of his opinions introducing them by the words 'I do not like.' This, of course, is a formidable obstacle because you can not very well discuss on the level of 'I do not like'. You can only discuss on the level of trying to enter into each other. But nevertheless, I accept that 'I do not like'. I think being ninety years old you will not change.

In the few minutes at my disposal, of course, it is not possible to talk about God the creator and, indeed, the very marked distinction in Christianity and also in the Old Testament between God and man, and the terms command and obedience, etc.. The only remark I want to make is that one should take notice of the fact these distinctions, as well as the concepts of justice and punishment have brought into at least that part of the world where Christianity has played a role a depth of conscience and a sensitivity of conscience which has been and is really one of the great dynamic powers in the world. That is not answering what you say but simply pointing to another aspect of it in order to make clear that we can not discuss about such big

distinctions between the whole world of thinking and feeling in Buddhism and in Christianity in such a short space of time. I am grateful that I know how you, with a background of Buddhism, react.

Then a few words about love. I can only make a side remark because I can not enter into the deeper discussion. The side remark is based on what the Bible says and that is of the greatest importance if one wants to do any justice to Christianity, at any rate. I am trying to do justice to Buddhism. Therefore, I say for a due understanding of the meaning of religion the other partner in the conversation should also try to understand. You can never talk in Christianity about love and also the love preached by Jesus Christ without knowing on the other side is a holy loving God, h-o-l-y not w-h-o-l-l-y, a holy loving God and that combination makes quite a different world.

'Let us agree to disagree.' I am often inclined to say that. I have too scholarly a temperament not to say that. But about the question of truth, there are moments when one must not say, 'let us agree to disagree'. There we must go to the depths and even struggle with each other to see how far the light guides us. If we say too early 'let us agree to disagree' then the whole world becomes a static world. Saying 'I am an Oriental. There I am'. 'I am an Occidental, there I am. I want to stay what I am and nothing else'. Then we can find a kind of United Nations which abolishes itself by saying 'let us divide the world into compartments that are strictly isolated from each other'. Intercourse between peoples rests also on argument, that goes so deep about truth that there are moments that we should not agree too easily to disagree. That are moments we must say it, both out of modesty and because we don't get any further and, at any rate, let us go on respecting each other. Let us mean it but let it not mean that the other can do what he likes and think what he likes because love is created for intercourse. Especially in the present time, we can not live by that maxim. We must not agree to disagree

but let us wrestle on and only stop at the moment that modesty asks us to be silent and respect each other.

Then, 'God is God, and God is man' that has struck me very much. Christianity says that but in quite a different way from what you mean. It says it in the incarnation — 'God is God and God is man'. God has, yes, fantastic to say, God has become man in order to find the way for quite a new world and quite, to talk in the terms of Tillich whom evidently you happen not to like also, a new being. But there I must simply stop because of lack of time.

It would be difficult to have a good conversation with a Protestant on your special love and affection for the Mary idea as it has developed in the Roman Catholic Church. There I would have to agree to disagree. Although that is not the only word that has to be said.

But if you say you do not like the idea of crucifixion then I think you mean you do not like the idea of crucifixion in the sense in which in the Christian faith the crucifixion of Jesus Christ is interpreted. Because the crucifixion itself is an historical fact and historical facts can neither be liked nor disliked. They are. We have to acknowledge them. The real meaning of the crucifixion, that has been a matter of special interpretation and if you mean that then we are to enter into a long and deep discussion. But I want to express the point, it is not an idea of crucifixion but the fact of crucifixion because it is an historical fact.

Professor Suzuki:

That is the very point I would like to say — Interwoven with the fact is a symbolization. Symbolization is human, subjective dealing with historical fact. Fact is fact, no doubt. But whether to prove it historically true is something I could not accept absolutely. But supposing that historical fact what I would like to say is that Christians symbolize that fact. That part I do not like.

Dr. Kraemer:

I do not say 'symbolize the fact' but they interpreted the fact.

There is a great difference between interpretation and symbolization. Interpretation means to elucidate and that, of course, remains so-called subjective opinion as long as you are not entering into the same faith because the basis of that interpretation is faith. The faith of an interpretation is not proved nor demonstrated.

The interpretation is the main thing. I can't enter into it because that can not be done in a few minutes. If I could then I would give you really a view of what the New Testament really means and how you find it. That is very necessary just because the crucifixion is not in the first place an idea but is an historical fact. Then a careful reading of the Gospels which is a very simple and realistic account of it would be very necessary in order to understand each other and also to understand your objections. There we can not talk in general terms. After all the Buddhists are accustomed to look at facts. Then we would have to look at the facts.

クレマー博士と日本仏教

ニュートン・サーバー

クレマー博士の来日によって、日本のキリスト教会は、日本宗教との接触の問題についての重要性を改めて認識する貴重な機会を与えられた。本稿は、博士が昨年10月24日に、大谷大学において、諸宗教センターによって計画された宗教懇談会に出席し、鈴木大拙、金子全栄、西谷啓治、山口益博士らと日本仏教およびキリスト教に関して懇談した時の内容の梗概を、録音テープより編集して読者に紹介しようとするものである。猶、席上では、京大文学部長であり、諸宗教センター専門委員長の有賀鉄太郎博士が通訳の労をとられた。

クレマー博士 私はかつてライデン大学の宗教史教授をつとめ、東洋に長く生活したことがある。今始めて日本を訪れ、日本の文化と宗教に関して、以前から外国語で書かれた書物にもとづいて得ていた私の智識を、より正しいものにしたいと念願している。第1に、私は仏教全般についての私の見解、第2に、浄土系の仏教について、キリスト教との関聯において質問し、第3には、私の質問したことに対してみなさんからお答えを願いたい。

一般的に言って、仏教は唯単に宗教的な面のみではなく、人類の歴史において世界にあらわれた思想体系として最も重要且つ印象的なものである。日本について言っても、仏教は今日まで日本の精神的、文化的要素の最も偉大なものとして、日本を形成してきた。今も猶、現代日本における重要な要素となっている。然し、日本仏教を研究して、果してそれが、原始仏教がもっていた意義と本質との比較において、可成りの変化を遂げていないであろうかと言う考えが生れてくる。日本人は、外来思想や形体を取り入れて、直ちにそれを日本人独特のものとして変様させる才能をもっている。その様な“日本化”が、日本仏教においても起ったと私には思わ

れる。私の主な質問は、「日本仏教は、仏教の概念と形体とをかりた日本主義ではないのか、又それは、もともと意図された様な仏教を忠実に日本的形体に翻訳したものであろうか」と言うことである。これと同様の傾向が、ジャバ人についても言うことができるのである（この項は省略）。

私は何時も、日本仏教はどの程度まで日本主義の形体であるのか、又それは本当に、典型的に日本の方法によって表現された仏教なのであろうか、と言うことを問いつづけている。もし、人々がすべて同じ方法で物事を表現するとすれば、世界は全く単調なものになってしまうわけである。

金子全栄博士 根本問題は発展の意味である。まづ我々は、形体ではなくて、何が原始仏教の真の本質であるかを検討し、それらが日本仏教の中に見出されるか否かを知らねばならぬ。仏教の教義で最も大切なものは、涅槃思想であるが、禅宗や真宗ではこの涅槃思想が根本思想として強調されているから、両者は共に正に仏教であると言えよう。けれども、釈尊の仏教的教説は、個人が正覚を得る為の道を開いたのである。が、親鸞の真宗では、この涅槃が個人のものではなく、万人の又、衆生の所有し得るものとされている。日本主義については色々の意見があるが、私はそれは、日本では“私有”と“共用”の両概念が、“公け”と言う概念において結合されている事実だと考える。この“公け”の思想は、明らかに家族とか家の概念から発展したものである。即ちそれは、世界は兄弟姉妹によって形成されている、人類は一家族である。この“公け”の理解においては自由と平等の間に矛盾は存在しない。

もう1つの思想は、“有難う”と言う日本的表現の中にある。この表現は、「私」と「汝」との関係を示すものではなくて、むしろ「自己」が感謝すべき環境におかれている事を見出すものである。仏教が日本化されてきたのは、この様な日本の思想の中においてであった。けれども、業とか因縁とか言う思想が始めて明瞭になったのも、この様な思想の上において

である。従って、業觀念を適用して、すべてを業の観点から見ようとする
ことが可能となった。

クレマー博士 原始仏教と言う言葉で、私は釈尊によって提起され
た“仏法”の中に含まれている根本的な、創造的な思想を意味したので
ある。涅槃思想が日本仏教の思想である事は私も充分知っているが、釈尊
によって教えられた“仏法”の中には、涅槃と同じく、輪廻 (saṃsāra)
と業 (karma) とが中心思想となっている。この輪廻と業思想は、真の正
覺乃至救済としての涅槃思想の発展にとって、欠くことのできない前提で
あると思うが、どうも日本仏教の中で、この輪廻と業思想とが決定的役割
を占めている様には思われない。けれども、原始仏教では、これらの思想
が極めて中心的、決定的要素であると思う。

つぎに浄土宗や真宗にあらわれている日本仏教の形体(組織)について、
それは原始仏教における僧侶と信徒との関係と違ったものがある様に思
う。私の仏教理解が正しいとするならば、僧侶(比丘)のみが所謂“僧伽”
であった。“優婆塞”や“優婆夷”は、僧侶の僧伽に奉仕することによっ
て僧伽とかわる可能性をもっていた。ところが、浄土宗や真宗では、僧
伽よりも信徒(俗人)の方がより重要なものの如く思われる。これは革命
的な変化と言うべきであろう。又、日本仏教特に真宗では、僧侶が結婚も
出来ると言うことであって、これは原始仏教における“仏法”のうちに生
きるという目的よりも、何か別な目的の為に僧侶となっていると言う事
を示している様にもみえる。私は決して論争しようとしているのではなく
て、日本仏教を私が正しく捕えているかどうかを知りたい為に、おたづね
しているのである。

つづいて重要な点は、個人のみならず、すべての思慮と知覚とを備えた
人々が考えねばならぬ問題である。即ち、現在、日本のみならず、全世界
が直面している政治的、社会的重要な問題に対して、仏教が論理的にのみな

らず、実際的にも明確な立場をもつことである。世界は唯単なる理論によって変化しているのではない。ダイナミックな行動へと転換せしめられてゆくダイナミックな理論によって変化している。私が今日この席につらなっているのは、私が偉大な世界宗教や文化の代表者と親しく語り合う事に大きな関心を持っているからである。何故ならば、私は将来、世界の偉大な宗教や文化が、相寄り相集う時が必ず来ると確信しているからである。今日までのところ、世界の宗教や文化が、真に、“出合う”時を得たとは言えない。それは猶、将来に残されたものであって、世界に対する責任を感じ、豊かな信仰と思想とを備えている人々に負わされている責務は、その様な“出会い”が、真に価値ある形体において行われることであって、論戦や不和の他何ものももたらさずに終る様なことがあってはならない。現代世界では、我々は不和とは全く正反対なものを互いに必要としているのである。

金子全栄博士 勿論、仏教をその初期の形体にもとづいて、それからどの様に発展したかと言う観方も成り立つ。然し、一方発展を1つの統一体とみて、その立場から、終りをみて始めを見ると言う観方もあるのではないか。どうして花が実ったかは、花からも、又実からも考えねばならない。そうしてはじめて形体の底に流れているものを把握することが出来る。又これは、直観によらないでは理解することが出来ない。

業、輪廻の問題については、浄土真宗には六道輪廻、苦業、地獄一定と言う言葉の中にその様な感じが見出しうと思う。僧伽の問題に関連しては、業思想が、衆生はすべて兄弟（血肉）であると言う思想と同じく、深い影響が考えられる。これらの観念と別箇に僧伽を考えることは、指導者の立場からのみ仏教を考えることである。浄土宗では指導者と被指導者との関係は、“有難う”の思想に見られる様な「主体」と「客体」とが1つの統一体のうちに置かれている様なものである。即ち「我」と「汝」とは

相関々係にあると言うよりも、「我」の上に「汝」を見、「汝」の上に「我」をみると言うものである。勿論、僧伽も同様に仏法の一部ではあるが、仏教における因果関係は、人類の業の意味をもっている。仏教では、人間としての自覚をもつだけで充分であるから、僧伽は必要がないということになる。逆に言うならば、業因関係の上におかれている人間であると言う自覚をもつならば、それが即ち僧伽である。親鸞は僧伽に属していない、指導者でもない人々の個性を表現しようと努めた。私はこれが神と人との関係であると思う。キリスト教の神については多くを知らないが、久遠仏は何か地上的なものの内に自己を表現しようと努めている。この相互関係のうちにすべてが自己意識に達する。そして人間の縁が仏教の縁ともなるのである。

真宗は組織体としてはたしかにルースであるが、同心の者の交わり以上に真宗の組織が出ないことは、反って又真宗の特色でもある。

ここで時間の関係上、最後の質問としてクレマー博士が提出した“キリスト教についてどの様な異議をもっておられるか”と言う問に対して、世界的に著名な禅宗学の権威鈴木大拙博士が次の様に答えた。

鈴木大拙博士 私は別にキリスト教に対して何も異議をもっているわけではない。私は唯キリスト教の教義を受け容れることが出来ない。クリスチャンにはかれらの好むところを、仏教徒にはかれらの好む道を行かせればよい。我々は互いに見解を異にしていると言う事に同意して、平和的にそれぞれの道を進もうではないか。

私がキリスト教の中で受け容れることの出来ない一つは、その二元論的思想である。神は命じ、人は服従する。この神性と人間性との間のきびしい区別を私は好まない。私は特に“審き”の思想を好まない。キリストはユダヤ教の律法主義を好まなかった。キリストは愛の福音を宣べ伝える為に

きた。私はキリストの愛の思想を全面的に受け容れるが、キリストもユダヤ教思想を完全に除去することはできなかった。もし愛が完全なものならば、それは絶対的なものでなければならぬ。罪人と善人との間に全く差別をもうけてはならない。私は審判思想を好まないとしたが、われわれは互いに審き合うものであつてはならないのだ。クリスチャンは、神は審きと言うが、人が互いに審き合うことなしに、どうして神が審きの神であると知ることが出来ようか。

キリストは、もしだれかが右の頬を打ったなら、左の頬をもむけよと言ったが、この中には差別の思想がある。もし、仏教徒が右の頬を打たれるならば、かれはそれを受け容れるが左の頬をも向けようとはしない。キリストは「汝の敵を愛せよ」と言ったが、仏教では「汝に敵は存在しない」と言う。もし「敵を愛する」と言うならば、それはもはや絶対的な愛とは私の認め得ない何物かがそこに存在している。愛は絶対的なものであり、分かち得るものではない。もし神が愛するならば、それは全きものでなければならぬ。人が神を愛する場合も同様である。しかし、神と人とは同一視し得るものではない。神はあくまでも神であり、人は人である。と同時に又、神は人であり、人は神である。

十字架の思想は、キリスト教における二元論的概念の中で最も代表的なものであろう。十字架はキリストにおける人間性の絶滅を意味する。然し、この十字架の思想にはサディスト的な要素が支配的な様に思われる。救われる為にはキリストの血を飲み、肉を食わねばならぬ。これは勿論象徴的なものであろうが、一体何故キリストの肉を食ひ、その血を飲まねばならぬのか。別にその様なサディスト的な象徴主義に許えなくてもよきそうに思われる。

然し、私はマリア崇拜の思想を最も好んでいと申したい。これは愛について最も満足すべき象徴的表現であらう。私は茲でイタリアの作家ペーニの小説に見られるペテロとマリアとの物語が、絶対的な愛を巧みに表

現していることを言及しておきたい。

私はまた、マリアが生けるままで天に上げられたと言う思想も強調したい。一体天国とは何処にあるのか。マリアは天で何をしているのか、マリアの使命は地上にあったので、天国ではない。とも角、マリアは偉大な愛を代表するものである。愛は地上において実現されるものではない。それは天国においてのみ実現される可能性がある。この全き愛が行われる時こそ、世の終りである。けれども、我々の使命は、我々が地上に生きる限りこの絶対的愛を實踐し、実現し得る様に努めることである。この場合には、地上も亦天国となりうる。その様な時は決して来ないであろうが、我々はその実現の為に努力しなければならない。

クレマー博士　御高齢にもかかわらず、鈴木博士が出席されて、私の提出した質問にお答え下さったことを感謝したい。然し、博上の出された問題に私が数分間で解決をつけることはできない。先づ始めに金子博士の申されたことについてお答えしたい。発展したものの光に照されて、元初のものの意味をよりよく理解しようとするのはわかる。新約聖書においても、その様な見方から、現代において新約聖書の意味を正しく具現化しているかどうかを見ることは大切である。然し、それでは多くの宗教において所謂宗教改革なるものが行われた時に、それは何時も、本来の、あるべきもとの姿に帰ろうとする努力であったと言う事実は、指摘された様な、唯単に実をもって化をみようとする方法とは異った努力であったことを忘れるべきではない。

扱、鈴木博士は「私は好まない」と言う言葉でもって、御自身の見解を多く表明された。然し、これは話し合いをなさそうとする目的のもとにあっては強い障害とならないであろうか。何故ならば、「私は好まない」と言う基盤のもとでは、充分に話し合いをすることが出来るとは思われないからである。我々はあくまでも、互いに他を理解しようとする努力する基盤の上

でのみ話し合いがおこなわれ得るのである。然し、とも角として、私は鈴木博士の「私は好まない」と言う表現を受け容れたい。もう90才を越えられた以上、博士がそう容易に変化されるとは思われないからである。残された僅かな時間で、キリスト教、ユダヤ教における神と人、命令と服従と言った顕著な思想について、語ることはできないが、博士が仏教的背景によって応えて下さったことに感謝したい。

私はこの様な2つの宗教の間に懇談がおこなわれる時には、宗教の正しい意味を理解する為に、互いに他を理解するように努めることが大切であると思う。キリスト教の愛について、キリストが教えられた愛について語ろうとするならば、一方には“聖にして、愛なる神”と言う思想のあることを忘れてはならない。この聖と愛との結合は、仏教と異った世界を生み出している。

「互いに見解を異にしていると言う事に同意しよう」と言われるが、少なくとも真理に関する問題については、この様な言葉は使ってはならぬ時がある。余り簡単にこの言葉を用いるならば、我々の世界は全くダイナミックな要素を失い、静的なものとなってしまう。私は東洋人だから、それに止まればよい。それでは全く互いに孤立した個室に閉ちこもってしまうことになる。我々は「意見を異にしていることに同意しよう」と言うべきではなく、互いに努力して謙虚に、尊敬の念をもって接すべきである。

「神は神であり、父神は人である」と言う言葉について、キリスト教は鈴木博士の言われるのと全く違った方法で語っている。即ち、キリスト教では「神が人の姿をとり給うた」と言う“受肉”の中に、神は神であり、父神は人であると述べているのである。

鈴木博士は、キリスト教の十字架の思想を好まないと言われたが、それはキリスト教がイエス・キリストの十字架を信仰的に解釈する仕方が好まないと言うことであろう。十字架は歴史的事実であって、好むと好まざるとにかかわらず、否定し得ないものである。十字架の意味と言うものは、

特別な解釈の問題であった。私の強調したいのは、十字架は唯単なる思想ではなくして歴史的事実であると言う点である。

鈴木大拙博士 私はそこに事実と象徴主義とが織り合わされていると言いたい。象徴主義と言うのは人間的なものであって、歴史的事実を主観的に取り扱ったものである。私の申したいのは、クリスチャンは十字架の事実を象徴化していると言うことで、それを私は好まないのである。

クレマー博士 私は「歴史的事実を象徴化している」とは言わない。「クリスチャン達は、事実を解釈している」のである。解釈することと象徴化することとは大きな相違点がある。解釈とは説明することであり、その信仰に入らぬ限りは主観的見解に止まると言われるであろう。何故ならば、解釈の基礎には信仰が存在するからだ。十字架に関する極めて簡単な、現実的な記事である福音書を注意深くよまれることが、互いに理解する為にも必要であろう。やはり仏教徒は、事実を客観的に見つめると言う事に馴れておられる様に思われるのである。(小林 栄要約)

Our Contributors

Dr. Tetsutaro Ariga, Dean of the Department of Literature of Kyoto University, is Chairman of the Special Committee for The Christian Center for the Study of Japanese Religions as well as a member of the Editorial Board of *Japanese Religions*.

Prof. Joseph M. Kitagawa is a member of the Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago and the author of numerous books and articles in the field of History of Religions. His latest book, published last year, is *Religions of the East*.

The Rev. L. Newton Thurber is engaged in student work under The United Church of Christ in Japan and is a member of the Editorial Board of *Japanese Religions*.

The Rev. Robert W. Wood is Professor of Christian Ethics in the School of Theology, Doshisha University, and serves on the Editorial Board of *Japanese Religions*.

